

No. 36811-1-II

---

**COURT OF APPEALS, DIVISION II  
OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

---

FILED  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION II  
08 APR - 8 PM 3:15  
STATE OF WASHINGTON  
BY *[Signature]*  
DEPUTY

**CITY OF GIG HARBOR,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**NORTH PACIFIC DESIGN, INC., and HUNT SKANSIE LAND,  
LLC,**

**Respondents.**

---

**AMENDED RESPONDENTS' BRIEF**

---

Alexander W. Mackie, WSBA No. 6404  
Kathleen M. O'Sullivan, WSBA No. 27850  
**PERKINS COIE LLP**  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099

Attorneys for Respondents  
North Pacific Design, Inc., and  
Hunt Skansie Land, LLC

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR .....	3
III. COUNTERSTATEMENT OF ISSUES .....	3
IV. COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
A. Background Facts Regarding the Proposed Development.....	4
B. Proceedings Before the Hearing Examiner.....	7
C. Proceedings Before the Superior Court .....	10
V. ARGUMENT .....	12
A. Standard of Review.....	12
B. The Hearing Examiner Correctly and Concurrently Read the RB-2 Zoning Ordinance and the PRD Ordinance, Which Do Not Conflict .....	13
1. Rules of Construction of Statutes and Municipal Codes .....	13
2. The Hearing Examiner Did Not Commit an Error in Process in Allowing the Conditional Use Permit and PRD Process to Be Used Concurrently to Approve a Single-Family Project in the RB-2 Zone that Did Not Exceed the 12-Unit Per Acre Maximum.....	14
3. The PRD Ordinance's "Density Bonus" Provision Is Inapplicable to Applications to Increase Density to a Density Permitted in the Underlying Zone .....	18
4. The Proposed Residential Density Is Not Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.....	22
5. Under the Code, a Rezone Is Not Required to Process Skansie Park as a PRD.....	24

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
C. The Hearing Examiner's Decision Is Neither an Erroneous Application of the Law to the Facts Nor an Erroneous Interpretation of the Law .....	31
1. There Was No Error in "Harmonizing" the RB-2 and PRD Provisions Because They Do Not Conflict .....	31
2. The Hearing Examiner Did Not Ignore the Language of GHMC 17.89.100 .....	33
D. The Hearing Examiner Erred in Equating the Perimeter Setback with the "Required Yards" that Must Be Excluded from the Calculation of Open Space .....	34
1. The Perimeter Setback Is Not a "Required Yard" Because It Is Not on a "Lot" .....	37
2. Related Provisions of the Code Confirm that There Is a Distinction Between "Required Yards" and "Setbacks" .....	39
3. The PRD Chapter Merely Incorporates the Setback Distance from That of Required Yards – It Does Not Create "Yards" in Conflict with the Code .....	40
VI. CONCLUSION.....	42

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Christensen v. Ellsworth</i> , 162 Wn.2d 365, 173 P.3d 228 (2007) .....	36
<i>City of Seattle v. Williams</i> , 128 Wn.2d 341, 908 P.2d 359 (1995) .....	37
<i>Cobra Roofing Servs., Inc. v. State Dep't of Labor &amp; Indus.</i> , 157 Wn.2d 90, 135 P.3d 913 (2006).....	36
<i>Emwright v. King County</i> , 96 Wn.2d 538, 637 P.2d 656 (1981).....	34
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. City of Seattle, Executive Services Department</i> , 160 Wn.2d 32, 156 P.3d 185 (2007).....	12
<i>Isla Verde Int'l Holdings, Inc. v. City of Camas</i> , 146 Wn.2d 740, 49 P.3d 867 (2002).....	12
<i>Johnson v. City of Mount Vernon</i> , 37 Wn. App. 214, 679 P.2d 405 (1984).....	30
<i>Judd v. American Tel. &amp; Tel. Co.</i> , 152 Wn.2d 195, 95 P.3d 337 (2004).....	14
<i>Kenart &amp; Associates v. Skagit County</i> , 37 Wn. App. 295, 680 P.2d 439 (1984).....	30
<i>Lakeside Indus. v. Thurston County</i> , 118 Wn. App. 886, 83 P.3d 433 (2004).....	24
<i>Lutz v. Longview</i> , 83 Wn.2d 566, 520 P.2d 1374 (1974).....	passim
<i>Maranatha Mining v. Pierce County</i> , 59 Wn. App. 795, 801 P.2d 985 (1990).....	7
<i>Pinecrest Homeowners Ass'n v. Glen A. Cloninger &amp; Assocs.</i> , 151 Wn.2d 279, 87 P.3d 1176 (2004).....	12
<i>Preserve Our Islands v. Shorelines Hearings Bd.</i> , 133 Wn. App. 503, 137 P.3d 31 (2006).....	32
<i>Schofield v. Spokane County</i> , 96 Wn. App. 581, 980 P.2d 277 (1999).....	30
<i>State v. Pacific Health Center, Inc.</i> , 135 Wn. App. 149, 143 P.3d 618 (2006).....	32
<i>United States v. Hoffman</i> , 154 Wn.2d 730, 116 P.3d 999 (2005).....	36
<i>Western Telepage, Inc. v. City of Tacoma</i> , 140 Wn.2d 599, 998 P.2d 884 (2000).....	13
<i>Wiggers v. County of Skagit</i> , 23 Wn. App. 207, 596 P.2d 1345 (1979).....	26, 29, 30
<i>Wright v. Miller</i> , 93 Wn. App. 189, 963 P.2d 934 (1998) .....	14

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Statutes</b>	
RCW 35A.63.....	28
RCW 36.70B.....	23, 42
RCW 36.70C.....	1, 12
<b>Regulations and Rules</b>	
RAP 10.4(c) .....	4
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
American Heritage College Dictionary (3d ed. 1997).....	31
VI WASHINGTON REAL PROPERTY DESKBOOK, § 90.5(2) (3d ed. 1996).....	29
<b>Gig Harbor Municipal Codes</b>	
GHMC 17.01.....	34
GHMC 17.04.....	passim
GHMC 17.05.....	11
GHMC 17.14.....	19, 31
GHMC 17.20.....	11
GHMC 17.24.....	11
GHMC 17.30.....	passim
GHMC 17.59.....	2
GHMC 17.64.....	passim
GHMC 17.78.....	40
GHMC 17.89.....	passim

## I. INTRODUCTION

This case involves the approval by the Gig Harbor Hearing Examiner ("Hearing Examiner") of the preliminary plat, including a conditional use permit and Planned Residential Development ("PRD") approval, for the project known as The Courtyards at Skansie Park ("Skansie Park"), and the appeal of that decision by the City Council of Gig Harbor under the Land Use Petition Act (Chapter 36.70C RCW). Skansie Park is a project involving the development of 174 single-family residential lots on 18.8 acres or approximately 9.25 units per acre. The applicant for plat approval and the property owner, respectively, were respondents North Pacific Design, Inc., and Hunt Skansie Land LLC, (collectively referred to as "North Pacific Design").

The appeal addresses two primary issues, referred to here as the "density appeal" and the "open space appeal." The density appeal involves interpretation of the Gig Harbor Municipal Code ("Code") provisions governing the project including:

- the zoning ordinance, Residential and Business District 2 (RB-2) (Chapter 17.30 GHMC), which allows single-family residential density of between 8 and 12 units per acre through a conditional use process;

- the conditional use approval provisions of Chapter 17.64 GHMC, which identifies specific public interest criteria that must be met if a conditional use is to be approved; and
- the Planned Residential Development criteria of Chapter 17.89 GHMC, which provides the process and standards for varying lot sizes and dimensions necessary to achieve the increased permitted densities.

The open space appeal addresses a single technical requirement as to the proper measure of open space acres in a PRD, and particularly whether a frontage "setback" on an open space tract creates a required "yard" that may not be included in open space under the terms of Chapter 17.89 GHMC.

The Hearing Examiner ruled in favor of North Pacific Design on the density issue and in favor of the City on the open space issue. On cross appeals to superior court, the court ruled in favor of North Pacific Design on both the density and the open space issues.

The City appealed. The City asks the Court to reverse the decision of the Hearing Examiner on the density issue in an argument that fails to give effect to all the relevant provisions in the City's land use development codes. The City also asks the Court to affirm the Hearing Examiner on the open space issue by creating a "yard" where one has never before existed.

North Pacific Design asks the Court to follow the standard guidelines for the interpretation of municipal codes, to read the provisions harmoniously, and to give meaning to all terms in the Code. North Pacific Design respectfully asks the Court to affirm the decision of the superior court in its entirety, to reverse the Hearing Examiner's condition regarding the open space calculation, and to otherwise affirm the decision of the Hearing Examiner.

## **II. ASSIGNMENT OF ERROR**

North Pacific Design asserts no errors by the superior court. North Pacific Design asserts that the Hearing Examiner erred in imposing condition no. 6, which required a revision of the plat to recalculate the amount of open space.

## **III. COUNTERSTATEMENT OF ISSUES**

1. Did the Hearing Examiner correctly approve North Pacific Design's application for a single-family detached subdivision at below the 12 dwelling units per acre maximum permitted in the RB-2 zoning ordinance, and to vary the lot size, yard setbacks, and other RB-2 development standards as permitted under the PRD ordinances to achieve the allowed density, as upheld by the superior court below?

2. Did the Hearing Examiner err regarding the calculation of required open space in the plat by erroneously equating the required "setbacks" with required "yards," as reversed by the superior court below?

#### **IV. COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE CASE<sup>1</sup>**

##### **A. Background Facts Regarding the Proposed Development**

North Pacific Design, Inc. is the applicant for the preliminary plat and conditional use permit at issue. Exh. 45, AR 142. Hunt Skansie Land LLC is the owner of the property the applicant seeks to develop. *Id.* The Skansie Park project is a PRD of 174 lots on approximately 18.8 acres located on the northeast corner of Hunt Street and Skansie Avenue in Gig Harbor.<sup>2</sup> Exh. 45, AR 148; Exam'r Decis. 9.

The request before the Hearing Examiner included a conditional use permit application to achieve the maximum density of dwelling units per acre in the RB-2 zone, and used the PRD provisions of GHMC to achieve the setback, lot area, lot width, and lot coverage necessary for single-family development at the requested density. Exam'r Decis. 9, ¶ 1;

---

<sup>1</sup> The Exhibits to the Hearing Examiner's decision are referenced as "Exh. \_\_," and the pages within the individual exhibits are referenced as "Exh. \_\_, AR \_\_" using the page numbers of the Administrative Record as transmitted to the superior court. The transcript of the hearing before the Hearing Examiner is referenced as "Tr. \_\_." The Hearing Examiner's decision, located at Exh. 90, AR 1177-1215, is referenced as "Exam'r Decis. \_\_." The Verbatim Report of Proceedings containing the superior court's oral decision is referenced as "RP."

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to RAP 10.4(c), various depictions of the Skansie Park PRD are attached as Appendix A to this brief, AR 574-75; all cited portions of the Gig Harbor Municipal Code are attached as Appendix B.

11, ¶ 15. All of the development would be single-family homes with garages. *Id.* The applicant proposed retaining a wetland and its buffer on site and proposed building three neighborhood parks, as well as building walking trails and providing for other open space. *Id.* 9, ¶ 1; 10, ¶ 8. Homes adjacent to the wetland would be set back 100 feet. AR 508-09. Other homes would be set back from 25 to 40 feet. *Id.* No building lots would be located on the perimeter of Skansie Park; rather, all of the 174 lots would be accessed via internal roads. *Id.*

The development site is located in property zoned Resident and Business District (RB-2), and is subject to additional restrictions imposed by a Concomitant Zoning Agreement adopted by the City Council when the property was annexed into the City. Exam'r Decis. 9, ¶¶ 2, 4. For example, the RB-2 zone permits multifamily development, *see* GHMC 17.30.010, whereas the Concomitant Zoning Agreement does not, Exh. 2, AR 46. The RB-2 zone is intended for a mix of "medium density" residential uses with certain business uses. GHMC 17.30.010. According to the City of Gig Harbor Comprehensive Plan ("Comprehensive Plan"), urban residential "moderate density" is four to 12 dwelling units per acre.

Exam'r Decis. 10, ¶ 7 (citing City of Gig Harbor Comprehensive Plan, Goal 2.3 at 2-3 (Dec. 2004)).<sup>3</sup>

The Comprehensive Plan for land use includes Goal 2.3, to "Promote Community Diversity and Distinction and Increase Housing Opportunities." Exam'r Decis. 10, ¶ 6. This goal, the Hearing Examiner explained, states an intent to "[p]rovide for a range of residential densities which would accommodate the City's 2022 residential growth target of 10,800 within a broad variety of housing types and tenures." *Id.* (quoting Comprehensive Plan Goal 2.3 at 2-7). Goal 2.3 discusses the implementation of a zoning plan "which allocates residential development based upon a maximum density as opposed to a minimum lot size in order to encourage optimum design techniques suitable to the land and its natural features." Comprehensive Plan, Goal 2.3.4 at 2-8.

The Code requires that common open space shall comprise at least 30 percent of any PRD. GHMC 17.89.110.A. For the 18.8 acre site, North Pacific Design proposed setting aside 5.66 acres of common open space, i.e., more than the minimum 30 percent. Exh. 68, AR 575. Part of the proposed common open space is the 25 to 40 foot buffer area that surrounds the entire plat. Exh. 68, AR 578.

---

<sup>3</sup> The City of Gig Harbor Comprehensive Plan is available online at <http://www.cityofgigharbor.net/pdfs/2004%20Comp%20Plan.pdf>.

The City planning staff recommended approval of the application, with conditions, in a 43-page report dated December 6, 2006. Exh. 1, AR 1-43. After explaining its analysis, the City planning staff concluded as follows: "Staff finds as mitigated, the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code, and Design Manual, [and] the public interest will be served by the subdivision and dedication." *Id.* at 36.<sup>4</sup> The only condition of relevance here is that the City planning staff recommended revising the plat to recalculate the open space area. *Id.* at 38.

**B. Proceedings Before the Hearing Examiner**

On December 13, 2006, the Hearing Examiner held an open public meeting on North Pacific Design's application. Exam'r Decis. 1. Twenty-two witnesses testified at the hearing. *Id.* at 8-9. The City emphasizes the number of citizens who testified in opposition to the applications,<sup>5</sup> but fails to mention those who testified in support, including the project architect, the City Engineer, and the City planner who presented the City Staff Report recommending approval of the application.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is significant to note that the Mitigated Determination of Nonsignificance found environmental impacts fully mitigated with the required conditions. Exh. 4, AR 79. The MDNS was not appealed and the case before the Court does not involve environmental impacts, simply code interpretation.

<sup>5</sup> The City's point is of no legal moment. Courts have long held that public opposition, without more, is not a proper basis for denial of a permit. *Maranatha Mining, Inc. v. Pierce County*, 59 Wn. App. 795, 805, 801 P.2d 985 (1990).

At the hearing, the City Attorney for the first time raised an objection regarding the density of the proposed development, an argument the City further explained in a letter dated December 19, 2006. Exh. 74, AR 925-929. The City argued that two provisions of the Code (the RB-2 provision and the PRD provision) were "conflicting" regarding density increases, and that the PRD provision "should control." *Id.* at 927-928. On January 5, 2007, North Pacific Design responded to the City's December 19 letter, and explained that there was no conflict within the Code and that the provisions could be read concurrently. Exh. 87, AR 1037-1040.

On January 24, 2006, the Hearing Examiner issued a 39-page decision approving North Pacific Design's application for the Skansie Park PRD with conditions. Exh. 90, AR 177-1218. In examining the criteria required for a conditional use permit under GHMC 17.64.040, the Hearing Examiner found that the neighbors' concerns regarding the project were unwarranted. For example, the Hearing Examiner noted that the "Building Official/Fire Marshall has reviewed the proposed plat with respect to fire apparatus access, fire separation, and fire hydrant location and has determined that the proposed plat, as conditioned, would meet these requirements." Exam'r Decis. 13-4. Similarly, the Hearing Examiner rejected concerns about traffic by citing evidence from the City: "the City

carefully considered AM traffic counts in reaching its decision to recommend preliminary plat approval." *Id.* at 4. The Hearing Examiner rejected concerns about water, sewer, and groundwater because the "application complies with applicable Public Works Standards." *Id.* at 13.

Of relevance to the density issue on appeal, the Hearing Examiner rejected the City's argument that "the PRD ordinance effectively nullifies the RB-2 conditional use standards with respect to density calculations, and that the PRD application constitutes a rezone." Exam'r Decis. 11, ¶ 11. Accepting North Pacific Design's interpretation of the Code, the Hearing Examiner was "persuaded that the two code sections should be read together" and because the "PRD application does not seek density greater than that conditionally permitted in the underlying RB-2 zone . . . the PRD application cannot constitute a rezone." *Id.*, ¶ 12. The Hearing Examiner further noted that the "City Council has expressly permitted that density in the RB-2 zone, with a conditional use permit." *Id.*

Accordingly, the Hearing Examiner approved the conditional use permit and the preliminary plat.

In approving the application, the Hearing Examiner also adopted the City planning staff's interpretation as to the calculation of the required amount of open space. Exam'r Decis. 16, ¶ 20. The Hearing Examiner reached this decision because he read GHMC 17.89.110.A as "indicat[ing]

that required yards may not be used for open space calculations." *Id.* at 17, ¶ 28. Based on this interpretation, the Hearing Examiner conditioned approval of Skansie Park on North Pacific Design revising the plat to provide for the required 30 percent open space set-aside in a manner that does not include the first 20 feet of setbacks around the structures located on the perimeter of the plat. *Id.* If performed, this condition would force North Pacific Design to redesign Skansie Park to provide an additional 20 feet of buffer in certain places, reducing the number of buildable lots from 174 to 160. *Compare* Exh. 68, AR 575 *with* Exh. 68, AR 819.

### **C. Proceedings Before the Superior Court**

Without challenging any of the factual findings of the Hearing Examiner, the City filed a land use petition challenging the Hearing Examiner's approval of the Skansie Park PRD. North Pacific Design filed a land use petition seeking review and reversal of the Hearing Examiner's conclusion regarding the open space calculation.

Following briefing by the parties and a review of the record, the superior court ruled in favor of North Pacific Design on all issues. RP 1-15 (oral ruling); CP 199-203 (written order). The superior court concurred with the Hearing Examiner's interpretation of the Gig Harbor Municipal Code on the density issue and affirmed the Examiner's decision to approve the preliminary plat and conditional use permit. RP at 6-9.

The court noted that the "RB-2 density provisions should be read together with the PRD provisions and not as mutually exclusive, which the City urges this court to do." RP at 6. The court further noted that GHMC 17.30.050.G, the RB-2 density provision, "expressly allows for 12 dwelling units per acre as a conditional use." *Id.* The superior court rejected the City's argument that GHMC 17.05.020, governing PRDs, precluded such an increase in density because North Pacific Design "was not seeking to increase density above and beyond the maximum number of units allowed in an RB-2 zone." *Id.* at 7.

The superior court also identified other provisions of the Code – not cited in the parties' briefing below – that supported the court's interpretation of the Code. GHMC 17.20.040.G (for R-2 zones) and GHMC 17.24.050.G (for R-3 zones) set the maximum density for those zones, but allow the density to be increased through the PRD process pursuant to Chapter 17.89 GHMC. RP at 8. The court noted the "direct contrast" in the language of those Code provisions with 17.30.050.G, which expressly permitted an increase of density "as a conditional use" and did not provide for increasing density through the PRD process. *Id.*

On the issue of the required calculation of open space, the superior court reversed the Hearing Examiner. The court concluded that "[b]ased on the plain language of the ordinances, the exclusion from the common

open space calculation includes only the required yards for each of the perimeter lots, not the required setbacks for the perimeter lots." *Id.* at 12.

The City appealed the superior court's decision. CP 196-203.

## V. ARGUMENT

### A. Standard of Review

In reviewing a land use decision, the Court stands in the same position as the superior court and limits its review to the record before the Hearing Examiner. *Pinecrest Homeowners Ass'n v. Glen A. Cloninger & Assocs.*, 151 Wn.2d 279, 288, 87 P.3d 1176 (2004).

The party seeking relief from the land use decision bears the burden of establishing that the Hearing Examiner "failed to follow a prescribed process," that his decision is an "erroneous interpretation of the law," or that it was a "clearly erroneous application of the law to the facts." RCW 36.70C.130(1)(a), (b), (d); *Pinecrest Homeowners Ass'n*, 151 Wn.2d at 288.

Statutory construction is a question of law reviewed de novo under the error of law standard, *Isla Verde Int'l Holdings, Inc. v. City of Camas*, 146 Wn.2d 740, 751, 49 P.3d 867 (2002). The Court applies the same rules of construction to municipal ordinances as it applies to state statutes. *Ford Motor Co. v. City of Seattle, Executive Servs. Dep't*, 160 Wn.2d 32, 41, 156 P.3d 185 (2007), *cert. denied*, 128 S.Ct. 1224 (2008). Because

neither the City nor North Pacific Design challenges any of the factual findings of the Hearing Examiner, the only issues on appeal are issues of law.

**B. The Hearing Examiner Correctly and Concurrently Read the RB-2 Zoning Ordinance and the PRD Ordinance, Which Do Not Conflict.**

**1. Rules of Construction of Statutes and Municipal Codes**

The "first rule" of statutory interpretation is that the Court should assume that the Legislature (or the City Council, when construing municipal codes) means exactly what it says. *W. Telepage, Inc. v. City of Tacoma Dept. of Fin.*, 140 Wn.2d 599, 609, 998 P.2d 884 (2000). The City flouts this rule in asking this Court to ignore the plain language of GHMC 17.30.050.G, which permits a density of up to "12 dwelling units per acre . . . as a conditional use" in an RB-2 zone, and to ignore the plain language of GHMC 17.89.100.A, which limits density increases to 30 percent but only where an applicant seeks to increase density "over that permitted in the underlying zone." These key provisions do not conflict; they may be read together without one having to "control" the other.

The City's interpretation of the Code is meritless, as it asks the Court to assume that the City Council did not mean what it wrote and to give no effect to the provisions of the Code quoted in the above paragraph. As the Washington Supreme Court has repeatedly explained, "all words in

a statute should be given effect," and in order to give those words effect, the court often must read together various statutory provisions in order to make sense of any particular provision. *Judd v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 152 Wn.2d 195, 203, 95 P.3d 337 (2004).

North Pacific Design agrees with those portions of the City's brief in which it explains these rules of statutory construction, particularly its explanation that statutes relating to the same subject matter that are not in conflict should be read in such a way as to "give meaning and effect to each." City's Br. at 37 (quoting *Wright v. Miller*, 93 Wn. App. 189, 198, 963 P.2d 934 (1998)). Ironically, the City argued to the Hearing Examiner that the relevant Code provisions conflicted and that the PRD provision controlled. Now the City contends that the Code provisions may be harmonized, but that the City should prevail whether or not the Code provisions conflict.

**2. The Hearing Examiner Did Not Commit an Error in Process in Allowing the Conditional Use Permit and PRD Process to Be Used Concurrently to Approve a Single-Family Project in the RB-2 Zone that Did Not Exceed the 12-Unit Per Acre Maximum.**

The Hearing Examiner and the superior court correctly interpreted three sets of regulations in approving the application for Skansie Park: the RB-2 zoning ordinance (Chapter 17.30 GHMC), the conditional use standards (Chapter 17.64 GHMC), and the PRD provisions (Chapter 17.89

GHMC). When read as a whole, these provisions of the Code provide that an applicant in the RB-2 zone may apply for single-family residential development at a density of a little over 3.6 units per acre without varying lot size, up to 8 units per acre by varying lot size, and up to 12 units per acre by varying lot size and satisfying the standards for grant of a conditional use permit.<sup>6</sup>

The Code makes clear that residential uses are allowed in the RB-2 zone. GHMC 17.30.010 states:

The RB-2 district is intended to provide a mix of medium density residential uses with certain specified business, personal and professional services. It is intended to serve as a transitional buffer between high intensity commercial areas and lower intensity residential areas.

The RB-2 zone ordinance goes on to provide the "permitted" uses, including a density of up to 8 dwelling units per acre, as well as a "conditional use" of up to 12 dwelling units per acre. GHMC 17.30.050.G.<sup>7</sup> The City defines "conditional use" in the Code's general "Definitions" section:

---

<sup>6</sup> GHMC 17.30.050.A provides for a minimum lot area of 12,000 square feet. GHMC 17.30.050.G provides for "[eight] dwelling units per acre permitted outright; 12 dwelling units per acre allowed as a conditional use." An acre is 43,560 square feet, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Acre>, so 12,000-square-foot lots would result in only about 3.6 dwelling units per acre.

<sup>7</sup> As the superior court noted, neither the R-2 nor R-3 zones allow increased density as a "conditional use," but only allow density to be increased through the PRD process. See RP at 8 (citing GHMC 17.20.040.G and 17.24.050.G). The difference in Code language must have meaning.

"Conditional use" means a use listed among those classified in any given zone but permitted only after a public hearing by the city and the granting of a conditional use permit imposing such performance standards as will make the use compatible with other permitted uses in the same district.

GHMC 17.04.260. The standards for granting a conditional use are detailed in another Code section, which provides:

Each determination granting or denying a conditional use permit shall be supported by written findings of fact showing specifically wherein all of the following conditions are met:

A. That the use which the conditional use permit is applied for is specified by this title as being conditionally permitted within, and is consistent with the description and purpose of the zone district in which the property is located;

B. That the granting of such conditional use permit will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare, will not adversely affect the established character of the surrounding neighborhood, and will not be injurious to the property or improvements in such vicinity and/or zone in which the property is located;

C. That the proposed use is properly located in relation to the other land uses and to transportation and service facilities in the vicinity; and further, that the use can be adequately served by such public facilities and street capacities without placing an undue burden on such facilities and streets;

D. That the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use and all yards, open spaces, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and other such features as are required by this title or as needed in the opinion of the examiner . . .

GHMC 17.64.040. City planning staff and the Hearing Examiner found that the North Pacific Design application satisfied these criteria. *See* Exh. 1, AR at 9-12 (City Staff Report); *see also* Exam'r Decis. 12-17. On appeal, the City does not challenge compliance with the conditional use criteria.

The final Code provision of relevance is Chapter 17.89 GHMC, the PRD ordinance. Chapter 17.89 GHMC provides a mechanism for varying the lot size, which was followed by the applicant, recommended for approval by the City planning staff,<sup>8</sup> and upheld by the Hearing Examiner and the superior court. The PRD ordinance also provides for an applicant to exceed the allowed density by 30% if additional "bonuses" are provided (e.g., providing additional open space and preserving scenic vistas and natural features). However, because North Pacific Design applied for a density specifically permitted by the City Council in the RB-2 zone, the Hearing Examiner recognized, as explained below, that this "density bonus" provision was inapplicable.

In sum, North Pacific Design has not engaged in any inappropriate "mixing and matching" of Code provisions and the City candidly admits it found no case law in support of that argument. City's Br. at 31. Rather, as the City planning staff, the Hearing Examiner, and the superior court

---

<sup>8</sup> With the exception of the definition of "yard," which is addressed below at V.D.

found, North Pacific Design's proposal was consistent with the underlying zone (GHMC 17.30.050) and with the PRD provisions (GHMC 17.89.050).

**3. The PRD Ordinance's "Density Bonus" Provision Is Inapplicable to Applications to Increase Density to a Density Permitted in the Underlying Zone.**

The density bonus argument involves the interpretation of two sections of the PRD ordinance (GHMC 17.89.050 and 17.89.100), and the Hearing Examiner's ruling that a "density bonus" was not sought for the Skansie Park plat.

The Code specifically provides for allowed uses in the PRD zone to include "primary, accessory and conditional uses permitted in the underlying zoning district." GHMC 17.89.050.A. The Code allows requests for "[other] residential . . . uses" with a "rezone application." GHMC 17.89.050.B. The Code then provides that if the PRD applicant requests "additional density," such additional density is limited to 30 percent and must provide the additional benefits outlined in GHMC 17.89.100. The City is asking the Court to ignore the language of GHMC 17.89.050.A (that primary, accessory, and conditional uses are "permitted" within a PRD), and rule that density allowed as a conditional use must be considered "*other . . . residential uses*" under GHMC 17.89.050.B and a "*density bonus*" under GHMC 17.89.100

The City argues that the Hearing Examiner and superior court failed to follow a prescribed process because they "allowed [North Pacific Design] to increase density in a PRD in violation of GHMC 17.89.100.A, which is [the] *exclusive* method for increasing density in a PRD." City's Br. at 20 (emphasis added). The City argues about what the Code "expressly" and "exclusively" provides without quoting from the relevant provision. GHMC 17.89.100 ("Density bonus") provides that "[t]he density may be increased in a PRD *over that permitted in the underlying zone* but only if: (1) consistent with the underlying comprehensive plan designation for the property; and (2) the density increase will not exceed 30 percent over the density allowed in the underlying zone." GHMC 17.89.100.A (emphasis added). Here, North Pacific Design sought approval to increase the density to at most 11.75 single-family units per acre,<sup>9</sup> a density that is expressly permitted in the underlying RB-2 zone as a conditional use. GHMC 17.30.050.G ("12 dwelling units per acre allowed as a conditional use").<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> In terms of the net buildable area, the Hearing Examiner noted that the proposed density was 11.75 dwelling units per acre. Exam'r Decis. 11, ¶14. Taking the development as a whole (174 units on 18.8 acres), the proposed total density is closer to 9.25 units per acre.

<sup>10</sup> The City also argues that density is not a "use" of the property, noting that there is no density listed as a "use" in the land use matrix for the RB-2 District. GHMC 17.14.020. But the Code expressly provides that "[t]o determine whether a particular use is allowed in a particular zoning district and location, all relevant regulations must also be consulted in addition to this matrix." GHMC 17.14.010. The City's argument ignores the plain language of the specific regulation regarding the RB-2 zone, which provides that

The City's argument that the Hearing Examiner erred rests on the false premise that North Pacific Design sought approval of a density "*over that permitted*" in the underlying zone. But North Pacific Design did not seek approval for 14 units per acre or some other amount beyond that permitted in the underlying zone. It sought approval for less than the 12 units per acre permitted, and that is what the Hearing Examiner granted, Exam'r Decis. 11, ¶ 12 ("[T]he PRD application does not seek density greater than that conditionally permitted in the underlying RB-2 zone."). This is precisely why the superior court affirmed the Hearing Examiner's decision. RP at 6 ("[T]he applicant in this case was not seeking to increase density above and beyond the maximum number of dwelling units allowed in an RB-2 zone.").

What the City repeatedly characterizes as the "exclusive" or "sole" method for increasing density in a PRD, *e.g.*, City Br. at 20, 34, is actually the exclusive method for increasing density in a PRD to a density in excess of that permitted in the underlying zone. Under the express language of the Code, GHMC 17.89.100.B's density bonus requirements (which require a developer to provide additional open space and other public amenities) do not apply to an application to increase density to an amount "permitted in the underlying zone." GHMC 17.89.100.A. In other

---

"12 dwelling units per acre [are] allowed as a conditional *use*." GHMC 17.30.050.G. (emphasis added).

words, these requirements do not apply here, where North Pacific Design sought a conditional use permit that would not exceed the maximum density permitted in the underlying RB-2 zone.

Because the City's interpretation of GHMC 17.89.100.A is flawed in ignoring that North Pacific Design did not seek to increase density "over that permitted in the underlying zone," the City's related argument regarding the requirements for proposals to develop land in a density greater than that permitted in the underlying zone is irrelevant. City's Br. at 29-31. Specifically, the City argues that the criteria in GHMC 17.89.100.B are applicable here and that the density increase should not have been approved if the density was inconsistent with the underlying comprehensive plan designation, if it proposed an increase of more than 30 percent over the density allowed in the underlying zone, or if the proposal did not include the provision of certain public amenities listed in GHMC 17.89.100.B. But those provisions apply "only if" the proposal would increase density "over that permitted in the underlying zone." GHMC 17.89.100.A. Because there is no proposal here to exceed the density permitted in the underlying zone, these latter provisions of GHMC 17.89.100.B are simply inapplicable.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> If the City were correct that the City intended to prohibit density increases of over 30 percent in a PRD to the minimum lot size in the underlying zone, it would render meaningless the designation of 8 units per acre as a matter of right and up to 12 units per

#### **4. The Proposed Residential Density Is Not Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan**

The City claims that the plat approval violates the Comprehensive Plan. But such argument cannot withstand scrutiny under the facts of this case. It is true that the City Comprehensive Plan identifies the general area in which Skansie Park is located as Employment Center. Exam'r Decis. 9; *see also* Comprehensive Plan, Land Use Map at 151. But a city planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA, Chapter 36.70A RCW) has wide discretion as to how to achieve its comprehensive plan goals. RCW 36.70A.3201.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, while the Comprehensive Plan land use map identified the overall area as an Employment Center, it remained within the City's discretion to elect to place a "transitional zone" between the more intensely developed core and the lower density residential zones that abutted the district. The RB-2 zone specifically provides as much:

---

acre allowed by conditional use permit. (12,000 square feet is about 3.6 units per acre; an increase of 30 percent would permit only about 4.6 units per acre). Likewise, if you begin with the permitted 8 units per acre as the base density and add 30 percent density, the result is only 10.4 units per acre. The 12 units per acre expressly permitted as a conditional use in the RB-2 zone could not be achieved under the City's reading.

<sup>12</sup> RCW 36.70A.3201 provides:

Local comprehensive plans and development regulations require counties and cities to balance priorities and options for action in full consideration of local circumstances. The legislature finds that while this chapter requires local planning to take place within a framework of state goals and requirements, the ultimate burden and responsibility for planning, harmonizing the planning goals of this chapter, and implementing a county's or city's future rests with that community.

"The RB-2 district is intended to provide a mix of medium density residential uses with certain specified business, personal and professional services. It is intended to serve as a transitional buffer between high intensity commercial areas and lower intensity residential areas." GHMC 17.30.010.

The zoning code adopted by the City is required to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. RCW 36.70A.040(3)(d). But when a zoning ordinance is adopted, it is presumed valid, *see* RCW 36.70A.320(1), unless and until it is demonstrated to be clearly erroneous through an appeal to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board, RCW 36.70A.320(3). No such appeals were ever filed for the sections in question, so it is a bit late for the City to be complaining that no residential development could occur in the area the Comprehensive Plan labels Employment Center, but that the City zoned as RB-2.

The fact that the City's zoning choice was not challenged ends the discussion as to whether the uses permitted in the RB-2 zone are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Once a development regulation is adopted by a City, the uses allowed under the zone are conclusive on such issues as the uses allowed on the property. RCW 36.70B.030(2)(a),.040(2).

Further, Washington courts have held that a specific zoning ordinance will prevail over an inconsistent comprehensive plan. *See, e.g., Lakeside Indus. v. Thurston County*, 119 Wn. App. 886, 894, 83 P.3d 433 (2004). The *Lakeside* case summarized the rule as follows:

Because a comprehensive plan is a guide and not a document designed for making specific land use decisions, conflicts concerning a proposed use are resolved in favor of the more specific regulations. Thus, to the extent the comprehensive plan prohibits a use that the zoning code permits, the use is permitted.

*Id.* at 894-95 (citation omitted).

Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan is a criteria for approval for "excess density" under GHMC 17.89.100, but residential single-family uses up to 12 units per acre are permitted in the RB-2 zone and the RB-2 zone is the presumptively valid transitional land use zone implementing the Comprehensive Plan. Even here, in a provision for excess density not applicable to Skansie Park, the City's argument is simply wrong and provides no basis for relief.

**5. Under the Code, a Rezone Is Not Required to Process Skansie Park as a PRD.**

The City asserts that the legal effect of approving a PRD is an action of "rezoning" from the underlying zone (the RB-2 zone) to the PRD zone, so that North Pacific Design was required to submit a rezone

application in order for the Skansie Park project to be approved. City's Br. at 25. The fundamental flaw with the City's argument, however, is that it ignores the language of the Code's PRD provision, which specifies when a rezone application is required in the City. The PRD provision provides:

The following uses are permitted in a PRD:

A. Those primary, accessory and conditional uses permitted in the underlying zoning district;

B. Other residential and low impact retail uses may be located within the PRD, *if a rezone application is submitted* concurrently with the preliminary PRD application, and all of the following criteria are satisfied, in addition to the rezone criteria in Chapter 17.100 GHMC . . .

GHMC 17.89.050 (emphasis added).<sup>13</sup>

Accordingly, under the Code, a rezone application is required *only* if the property owner seeks to use the property for a use not "permitted in the underlying zoning district" under the provisions of GHMC 17.89.050.A. Where the City Council has expressly provided in the Code that no rezone application is required for a property owner who seeks to develop a PRD for uses permitted in the underlying zoning district, the Court may not superimpose on developers a requirement to the contrary. To do so would violate the canons of statutory interpretation: it would

---

<sup>13</sup> The PRD provision elsewhere provides: "If the PRD requires a rezone(s), such rezone(s) shall be approved before or concurrently with the PRD . . . approval." GHMC 17.89.070.C. If every PRD were a "rezone," this language would be meaningless.

ignore the directive to assume that the City Council meant what it wrote, and instead would assume that subsection A of 17.89.050 was meaningless. The Hearing Examiner wisely rejected the City's argument that a rezone is required here. *See Exam'r Decis.* 11. ("Here, the PRD application does not seek density greater than that conditionally permitted in the underlying RB-2 zone. As such, the PRD application cannot constitute a rezone . . . "). This Court should affirm that decision.

The City contends on appeal, as it argued below, that all PRDs must be treated as a request for a rezone, apparently without regard to the specific language in the Code. The City's argument is taken from cases that have made the general statement, "[t]he legal effect of approving a planned unit development is an act of rezoning." City's Br. at 25 (quoting *Wiggers v. County of Skagit*, 23 Wn. App. 207, 596 P.2d 1345 (1979)). This language originated in a very different factual setting first articulated in the Washington Supreme Court's decision in *Lutz v. City of Longview*, 83 Wn.2d 566, 567, 520 P.2d 1374 (1974), when planned unit developments ("PUDs") were "a relatively new concept in planning," *Id.* at 568-69.<sup>14</sup>

In *Lutz*, the property owner applied for a PUD for permission to erect two large multi-story, 28-unit buildings in a tract classified as a low

---

<sup>14</sup> The cases refer to PUDs and PRDs without distinction on this topic.

density single-family residential zone. *Id.* at 567, 569. The court noted that "[t]he change in permitted use is obvious." *Id.* at 569. As a result, the court asked the question, "What is the legal nature and effect of the act of imposing a PUD upon a specific parcel of land?" *Id.* at 568. Given the existing zoning of the specific parcel of land before it, the court concluded that the PUD proposed for multi-story, multi-unit buildings in the Longview single-family zone "is an act of rezoning which must be done by the city council because the council's zoning power comes from the statute and that is what the statute requires." *Id.* at 568-69.

*Lutz* is distinguishable because here, as explained above, the Code permitted a density of up to 12 units per acre as a conditional use in the underlying zone. There would be no change in permitted use, let alone such an "obvious" change that would warrant a rezone. *Lutz* is also distinguishable because the Gig Harbor Municipal Code expressly distinguishes between projects involving PRDs that require a rezone and those that do not. Those involving "primary, accessory, and conditional uses permitted in the underlying zoning district," GHMC 17.89.050.A, do not require a rezone application, whereas developers of "other residential . . . uses" are specifically directed to submit a rezone application, GHMC 17.89.050.B. General language from *Lutz* or any of the other cases cited by the City – all involving codes or laws from places other than Gig

Harbor – cannot trump the specific distinction between GHMC 17.89.050.A and 17.89.050.B.

The City also emphasizes the *Lutz* court's conclusion that "it is an act of rezoning" while ignoring the court's explanation of *why* it was an act of rezoning: because "that is what the statute requires." 83 Wn.2d at 568-69. What the statute requires, the Court went on to explain, is that "[o]nly the legislative body is empowered to adopt a zoning map and ordinance." *Id.* at 570 (citing RCW 35A.63.100). Here, the Code does not require a zoning change because the underlying RB-2 zone permits up to a 12-unit per acre density, which is less than that sought by North Pacific Design.

The distinction reflected in Sections A and B of GHMC 17.89.050 reflects the one articulated by commentators who sought to explain the difference between PRD provisions warranting a rezone and those that do not.

Because a PUD has no single definition, use caution in applying the statements in one case when analyzing a different situation involving a different local ordinance. For example, if a local PUD ordinance allows the establishment of uses on a parcel of property which would otherwise not be permitted by the underlying zoning, that ordinance would fit the model established by the court in *Lutz*. However, *in some instances a PUD ordinance does not authorize the establishment of a use that is not already permitted in the underlying zone. In those instances a PUD is little more than a regulatory technique that provides*

*some flexibility with respect to siting regulations, such as lot dimensions or building setbacks, and a more thorough review of a project . . . There is no reason why a local government or a court should treat such a PUD as a rezone.*

6 WASHINGTON REAL PROPERTY DESKBOOK § 90.5(2), cmt. at 90-16 (3d ed. 1996) (emphasis added).

This is not a case like *Lutz* where the local PUD ordinance allows the establishment of uses on a parcel of property "not already permitted in the underlying zone" *Id.* Rather, the PRD provisions here provide the administrative guidelines to govern the review of a request for residential density in the RB-2 zone between the 3.6 units per acre allowed with required minimum lot sizes, the 8 units per acre allowed by adjusting the minimum lot and yard requirements through the PRD process, and the 12 units per acre allowed by adjusting the minimum lot size and yard requirements through the PRD process and meeting the additional requirements of the conditional use process.

*Lutz* and the other cases cited in the City's Brief at pages 25-28 do not support the proposition that a rezone is required under all circumstances where a PRD is used. For example, *Wiggers v. County of Skagit*, 23 Wn. App. 207, 596 P.2d 1345 (1979), is another case of "obvious" change of use requiring a rezone. In an area zoned residential, the developer proposed a 20-division project that included six acres of

commercial and condominium developments plus over 100 campsites. *Id.* at 209. Similarly, *Schofield v. Spokane County*, 96 Wn. App. 581, 583, 980 P.2d 277 (1999), involved an "obvious" change in permitted use because a developer proposed to rezone land from general agricultural to semi-rural residential to construct 10 residential homes on lots as small as 1.13 acres in this formerly agricultural zone. *Id.*<sup>15</sup>

Though the City attempts to use these cases expansively, they dealt with fundamentally different code provisions, allowed changes that were materially different from those reasonably expected from a reading of the underlying code, and involved changes of such significance that only a legislative determination was allowed to put the change in place. In that regard, the fact patterns in the cases relied on by the City are distinguishable from the facts here, where North Pacific Design applied to use the PRD process to achieve a use of the land that was specifically permitted in the underlying RB-2 zone.

---

<sup>15</sup> Further, in *Kenart & Associates v. Skagit County*, 37 Wn. App. 295, 680 P.2d 439 (1984), and in *Johnson v. City of Mount Vernon*, 37 Wn. App. 214, 679 P.2d 405 (1984), the court did not "hold" that a request for approval of a PUD is treated as a request for a rezone. In *Kenart*, the issue was whether the Board of County Commissioners' decision to deny the PUD application (for increased density and for inclusion of a gravel mine in a residential reserve zone) was supported by factual findings based on evidence in the record. 37 Wn. App. at 302-03. The Court's holding was to reverse and remand to the Board for further hearing and clarification of those factual findings. *Id.* at 303. Moreover, the developer in *Kenart* was seeking to increase density over that permitted in the underlying zone and to include a gravel mine in that residential zone. *Id.* at 298. *Johnson* similarly involved an underlying zone that made no provision for the increased density sought by the developer. 37 Wn. App. at 218.

In Gig Harbor, the RB-2 zone already permits single-family density up to 12 units per acre, which is why the Hearing Examiner rejected the City's argument that a rezone was required. The Supreme Court stated in *Lutz* that "[o]bviously the state has vested the authority to zone and rezone solely in the city council." 83 Wn.2d at 570. In Gig Harbor, the legislative decision to allow 12 units per acre and the review criteria by which such density is to be achieved have already been spelled out. The underlying zone (RB-2), the conditional use criteria, the PRD process, and the criteria for primary, accessory, and conditional uses are laid out in the Code. *See generally* Ch.17.30 GHMC (RB-2 zone); Ch. 17.14 GHMC (permitted uses in each zone); Ch. 17.64 GHMC (conditional use criteria); Ch. 17.89 GHMC (PRD process). Where the Gig Harbor City Council chose to require a rezone application for certain PRDs, but not those where the property owner proposes a use permitted in the underlying zone, the Court may not second-guess that decision, as to do so would usurp the authority of the City Council.

**C. The Hearing Examiner's Decision Is Neither an Erroneous Application of the Law to the Facts Nor an Erroneous Interpretation of the Law.**

**1. There Was No Error in "Harmonizing" the RB-2 and PRD Provisions Because They Do Not Conflict.**

To "harmonize" means to "be or come into agreement." *The American Heritage College Dictionary*, 620 (3d ed. 1997). The City

argues that one can only "harmonize" provisions if one provision is ambiguous, but this argument is not supported by legal authority and is not correct. Courts harmonize legislative enactments by reading all related provisions first and only then look to see whether ambiguity exists. *See, e.g., Preserve Our Islands v. Shorelines Hearings Bd.*, 133 Wn. App. 503, 519, 137 P.3d 31 (2006), *review denied*, 162 Wn.2d 1008 (2008); *State v. Pac. Health Ctr., Inc.*, 135 Wn. App. 149, 159, 143 P.3d 618 (2006).

The City then regurgitates its argument that the "sole" method to increase density in a PRD is through the density bonus requirements in GHMC 17.89.100.A, which North Pacific Design responded to above, *supra*, V.B.3, noting that the City ignores the PRD provision that a "conditional use" is a "permitted use" and rezone requirements apply only to developments that seek to increase density "over that permitted in the underlying zone." GHMC 17.89.100.A and .050.B.

North Pacific Design agrees with the City that there is no ambiguity in GHMC 17.89.100. Because there is no ambiguity, the Hearing Examiner need not have identified any ambiguity. The Hearing Examiner did not disregard the words "but only if" repeatedly quoted by the City, *see* City's Br. at 37; they simply do not apply here, as explained above.

**2. The Hearing Examiner Did Not Ignore the Language of GHMC 17.89.100.**

The City argues that the Hearing Examiner "totally ignore[ed] all of GHMC 17.89.100" (the PRD provision), and approved the conditional use permit for additional density "without observing the 30 percent limitation on density, the prohibition on additional density because of the property's comprehensive plan designation or NPD's failure to provide additional amenities." City's Br. at 36. The fatal flaw in the City's arguments recognized by the Hearing Examiner is that a request to achieve 12 units per acre in the RB-2 zone is a request to achieve a "permitted density," so provisions about "increased density" are simply not applicable. The City's argument here is a re-hash of arguments made by the City earlier in its brief to which North Pacific Design responded above, *supra*, V.B.3. The City planning staff, the Hearing Examiner, and the superior court did not "throw out" GHMC 17.89.100; instead, they carefully followed the language of GHMC 17.89.100.A, which contains the density bonus requirements the City invokes here, but which apply only where a developer seeks to increase density "over that permitted in the underlying zone."

The Hearing Examiner carefully gave effect to both the RB-2 provisions and the PRD provisions, and the Court should reject the City's

attempt to extend the density "bonus" requirements that have no applicability here.<sup>16</sup> Though the City has attempted to manufacture a conflict, it does so without giving consideration to all of the language of GHMC 17.89.100 and GHMC 17.30.050. The City's conclusion simply is not supported by the language of the Code.

**D. The Hearing Examiner Erred in Equating the Perimeter Setback with the "Required Yards" that Must Be Excluded from the Calculation of Open Space**

GHMC 17.89.110.A requires Skansie Park to designate at least 30 percent of the gross area of the PRD as common open space. The calculation of this open space area may not include "public or private streets, driveways, parking areas *or the required yards for buildings or structures . . .*" GHMC 17.89.110.A (emphasis added). It is undisputed that Skansie Park's designated open space does not include streets, driveways, or parking areas. The sole issue is whether Skansie Park has included "required yards" as part of its open space calculation.

The Hearing Examiner mistakenly sought to delete dedicated open space from the 30 percent requirement in GHMC 17.89.060.A that

---

<sup>16</sup> The City cites GHMC 17.01.060 to assert that the PRD density provision must control over the RB-2 density provision because the City asserts that the PRD provision is "more restrictive" and more recent. However, this provision of the Code requires that there be an actual conflict among Code provisions. As explained above, there is no conflict and the Court may give effect to both. See *Emwright v. King County*, 96 Wn.2d 538, 543, 637 P.2d 656 (1981) (related provisions should be harmonized whenever possible so as to give effect to both).

structures located on the perimeter of the PRD be "set back in accordance with the front yard setbacks of the underlying zone." The error of law is that only required yards must be excluded from open space and a permitted setback, standing alone, does not create a "required yard" for exclusion purposes. The exclusion was erroneous and was properly reversed by the superior court.

In evaluating the Hearing Examiner's error, the Court should consider that the Code separately defines the terms "setback," "yard," and "lot" and give effect to all of those definitions. The terms are not interchangeable. The Hearing Examiner's decision did not give effect to the definitions of these terms in the Code and as a result misapplied the Code provisions at issue to the facts of this case.

The superior court, reversing the Hearing Examiner's interpretation, correctly concluded that under the plain language of the Code, the exclusion from the open space calculation includes only the required yards for each of the perimeter lots, not the required setbacks for the perimeter lots. The Court should likewise conclude that the Hearing Examiner erred on the open space issue.

Determination of the open space question is a matter of statutory interpretation. "Where statutory language is plain and unambiguous,

courts will not construe the statute but will glean the legislative intent from the words of the statute itself, regardless of contrary interpretation by an administrative agency." *United States v. Hoffman*, 154 Wn.2d 730, 737, 116 P.3d 999 (2005) (internal quotations and citations omitted). The mere fact that different interpretations are possible does not make a statute or municipal code provision ambiguous. *Id.*

A court's primary objective in interpreting a statute is to determine the legislature's intent, giving effect "to that plain meaning as an expression of legislative intent." *Christensen v. Ellsworth*, 162 Wn.2d 365, 372-73, 173 P.3d 228 (2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). "Plain meaning is discerned from the ordinary meaning of the language at issue, the context of the statute in which that provision is found, related provisions, and the statutory scheme as a whole." *Id.* at 373. Where a term is defined in the statutory provision, the Court must use that definition and give it effect. *See, e.g., Cobra Roofing Servs., Inc. v. State Dep't of Labor & Indus.*, 157 Wn.2d 90, 101, 135 P.3d 913 (2006); *Hoffman*, 154 Wn.2d at 741 ("It is an axiom of statutory interpretation that where a term is defined we will use that definition."). Though the City argues that the Code is "clear" on the open space issue, it does so without discussing the separate and distinct definitions of the terms it uses interchangeably to support its argument. *See, e.g., City's Br.*

at 49. Nonetheless, statutory construction demands that where, as here, different terms are used, the differences are to be given meaning so that no term is rendered mere surplusage. *City of Seattle v. Williams*, 128 Wn.2d 341, 348-49, 908 P.2d 359 (1995). A review of the applicable terms shows the Hearing Examiner failed to follow the specific terms of the City Code in excluding perimeter open space from the 30 percent calculation.

**1. The Perimeter Setback Is Not a "Required Yard" Because It Is Not on a "Lot"**

The Code defines a "yard" as a "required open space that is on the same *lot* with the principal use and is unoccupied or unobstructed by any portion of a structure." GHMC 17.04.880 (emphasis added). This definition conforms with the common understanding of a yard as the unimproved land adjacent to a residence and part of that residence's own property. The Code goes on to define the term "lot" as "an area of land that is described by . . . recorded plat and is to be used, developed or built upon as a single unit of land." GHMC 17.04.450. Here, Skansie Park contains 174 developable building "lots." Exh. 68, AR at 574.

Under the Code, a required component of any "yard" is that it be located on a building "lot." The Skansie Park PRD proposes 174 individual building "lots" within the PRD for single-family residences and

their accompanying "yards." Exh. 68, AR at 696 (Skansie Park Preliminary Plat).

The City Staff Report and the Hearing Examiner recognized that Skansie Park proposed 174 "lots," as that term is used in the Code. *See* Exh. 1, AR at 1 (describing Skansie Park as a "174-lot residential preliminary plat"); *see also* Exam'r Decis. 1, 9.

In this case, the 25-foot perimeter setback extends from the outside boundary of the lots to the boundary of the perimeter. *See* Exh. 68, AR at 575. The setback does not extend into any lot.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, none of Skansie Park's designated common open space falls within any portion of the 174 buildable lots or the yards attendant to those lots. *See id.*

The only "yards" created by the Skansie Park PRD are those yards attached to one of the proposed 174 residential lots. In contrast to the 174 residential lots, the entire Skansie Park PRD is surrounded by a dedicated open space "tract." *See* Exh. 68, AR at 696; *see also* GHMC 17.04.800 (defining a "tract" as a "parcel of land in single ownership that has not been subdivided into lots"). As depicted on the preliminary plat, the

---

<sup>17</sup> It is possible that in some cases the perimeter setback would run through a "required yard," and be correctly excluded from an open space calculation. For example, in a PRD in which the lot boundaries ran along the perimeter of the PRD, the residence would be required to be set back 20 feet from the perimeter line. The setback would then be contained within the lot and would be part of the "required yard." This is not the case in Skansie Park, where none of the lots is on the PRD's perimeter.

perimeter dedicated open space tract is an entirely separate tract separate from the individual lots, and contains no residential structures. *Id.*

**2. Related Provisions of the Code Confirm that There Is a Distinction Between "Required Yards" and "Setbacks"**

The City's interpretation of the Code necessarily and erroneously equates a "yard," as defined by the Code and as explained above, with a "setback." But even a cursory reading of the Code makes clear that the two terms cannot be synonymous.

The Code defines a "setback" as "the distance between the building line and the nearest boundary to the site *or* lot, measured at right angles to the boundary." GHMC 17.04.720 (emphasis added). Unlike a "yard," a "setback" may be from either the boundary line of a site or a lot. In other words, the Code's definition of the term "setback" is expressly *not* limited to lots or yards, but also includes setbacks from "site" boundaries. Here, it is undisputed that the 20 feet the Hearing Examiner held must be excluded from the open space calculation extends beyond, rather than within, the "lot" boundaries and into the designated common open space "tract."<sup>18</sup> The required "setbacks" cannot be properly considered "yards" as they extend beyond the boundary of the individual buildable lots and therefore

---

<sup>18</sup> GHMC 17.04.800 defines a "tract" as a "parcel of land in single ownership that has not been subdivided into lots in conformance with the applicable laws of the state, county or city." Under this definition, the common open space buffer area is a tract as opposed to a developable or buildable lot.

do not meet the Code's definition of a "yard." GHMC 17.04.880 ("required open space that is on the same lot with the principal use and is unoccupied or unobstructed by any portion of a structure"). The required setback from the perimeter of the site is just that – a setback from the site boundary, not a required "yard."

Requiring a "setback" does not equate to creating a "yard" under the Code. Since the Code provides different definitions for each term, both must be given effect. Notably, in other portions of the Code, the City specifically recognizes the distinction between "required yards" and "setback area[s]." *See, e.g.*, GHMC 17.78.060.A.1 (in establishing landscaping requirements, "[t]he required width of perimeter areas to be landscaped shall be at least the depth of the required yard or setback area").

**3. The PRD Chapter Merely Incorporates the Setback Distance from That of Required Yards – It Does Not Create "Yards" in Conflict with the Code**

The Hearing Examiner's decision on this issue was based on misreading a separate setback provision governing the determination of the distance of required perimeter setbacks. The PRD chapter provides that, while the performance standards of the RB-2 district may be varied in a PRD, "[s]tructures located on the perimeter of the PRD shall be set back in accordance with the front yard setbacks of the underlying zone."

GHMC 17.89.060.A.2. The Hearing Examiner misread this provision to equate the "setbacks" required in GHMC 17.89.060.A.2 with "required yards for buildings or structures" in GHMC 17.89.110.A.

As a result, the Hearing Examiner erroneously concluded that the perimeter setbacks could not be included in the open space calculation for the project. Exam'r Decis. 17. The superior court, however, correctly recognized that the term "yard" was "noticeably missing" from the setback requirement, which applies to the perimeter, not the "perimeter yard." RP at 11.

GHMC 17.89.060.A does not equate the perimeter "setback" with a "yard," as the terms are separately defined. GHMC 17.89.060.A merely looks to the underlying zone to establish the required perimeter setback *distance*.

The PRD perimeter setback requirement, which is separate and distinct from the yard requirement, requires that all perimeter structures be set back from the perimeter of the PRD in accordance with the "front yard" setback of the underlying zone, here 20 feet. GHMC 17.30.050. There is no dispute that all of the perimeter lots of Skansie Park are set back from the perimeter at least 20 feet.

The Hearing Examiner nonetheless concluded that the open space calculation must be revised so that it "does not include the required 20 foot

*yards* around the perimeter of the plat." Exam'r Decis. 33 (emphasis added). In its brief the City makes the same mistake, referring to the "perimeter yard setback area" without addressing the definitions of "yard" or "setback" in the Code. City's Br. at 49. However, the 20-foot distance borrowed from the RB-2 zone does not change the character of the setback or create any excludable "required yards." The City's interpretation (accepted by the Hearing Examiner) ignores the applicable Code definitions and is therefore erroneous. Under the Code, "setbacks" and "yards" have distinct definitions and are not interchangeable.

Because incorporating and applying a distance requirement for setbacks in this fashion does not create excludable yards, the Hearing Examiner's conclusion to the contrary should be reversed and the superior court's affirmed.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

The legal issues presented in this appeal are strictly those involving the interpretation of the Gig Harbor Municipal Code. The superior court got this interpretation right on both issues. Our state's Legislature has clearly provided that where development regulations permit a specific use or density, these regulations are "determinative" for the body reviewing the project application. RCW 36.70B.030. These regulations are determinative in order to provide certainty and predictability, and to avoid

permit decisions based solely on public opinion and political pressure. In this case, the Court should give effect to the plain language of the Code's development regulations, which will result in approving the preliminary plat and conditional use permit for the Skansie Park residential subdivision.

For the foregoing reasons, North Pacific Design respectfully asks the Court to reverse the Hearing Examiner's condition of approval requiring a revised open space calculation, and to otherwise affirm the decision of the Hearing Examiner.

DATED: April 8, 2008

**PERKINS COIE LLP**

By:  (for Kathleen O'Sullivan)

Alexander W. Mackie, WSBA No. 6404  
Kathleen M. O'Sullivan, WSBA No. 27850  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Telephone: 206.359.8000  
Facsimile: 206.359.9000

Attorneys for Respondents North Pacific Design,  
Inc. and Hunt Skansie Land, LLC

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that, on April 8, 2008, she caused to be served on the person(s) listed below in the manner shown:

AMENDED RESPONDENTS' BRIEF.

Carol A. Morris,  
Law Office of Carol A. Morris, PC  
P.O. Box 948  
Seabeck, WA  
98380-0948

Attorney for Appellant

Sean K. Howe  
Cairncross & Hempelmann  
524 Second Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104

Attorneys for Intervenor Bennett  
Development, Inc.

- United States Mail, First Class
- By Messenger
- By Facsimile
- By eFiling


FILED  
COURT OF APPEALS  
DIVISION II  
08 APR -8 PM 3:45  
STATE OF WASHINGTON  
BY \_\_\_\_\_  
DEPUTY

Dated at Seattle, Washington, this 8th day of April, 2008.

*Sharon Sundmark*

Sharon Sundmark

# **APPENDIX A**



PRESENTATION SITE PLAN  
SCALE: 1" = 50'

GH 000574

A-1  
OF SHEETS

PRESENTATION  
SITE PLAN  
2005.08.02


NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION
1	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
2	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
3	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
4	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
5	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
6	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
7	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
8	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
9	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING
10	08-01-05	GH	ISSUE FOR PERMITTING

**Hunt & Skansie Residential Project**  
**Preliminary Site & Architecture**  
 PRELIMINARY SCHEMATICS  
 Gig Harbor WA 98335

Project Name: Hunt & Skansie Residential Project  
 Project No.: GH 000574  
 Date: 08-01-05  
 Scale: 1" = 50'  
 Drawing No.: A-1  
 Total No. of Sheets: 10



NEW GROSS AREA (3' & 5' FT. SKANSIE PLANT R/W REMOVED) - 810,399 S.F.  
 OPEN SPACE AREA (AS PER G.M.C. 17/89.110) - 241,956 S.F. (30%)  
 ACTUAL OPEN SPACE (WITH 21,872 S.F. WETLAND AREA) - 263,828 (33%)  
 TOTAL LOTS 174



NORTH  
 SITE PLAN

GH 000575

SEPT. 08  
 1

NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION

**The Courtyards at Skansie Park**  
**Exhibit A 174 LOTS**  
 SITE PLAN OPEN SPACE  
 Glg Harbor WA 98335

Paul R. Hays Lead  
 Scott A. Hays  
 Greg Hays  
 M. Hays



## **APPENDIX B**

## Chapter 17.01

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## Sections:

- 17.01.010 Title.
- 17.01.020 Purpose.
- 17.01.030 Conformity with regulations required.
- 17.01.040 Public uses.
- 17.01.050 Interpretation and application of provisions.
- 17.01.060 Conflict with other regulations.
- 17.01.070 *Repealed.*
- 17.01.080 Conformance required – Fence or shrub height.
- 17.01.090 Construction trailers – Temporary uses.

**17.01.010 Title.**

This title shall be known and cited as the “Zoning Ordinance of the City of Gig Harbor, Washington,” as passed and adopted by Ordinance 573, approved on February 26, 1990. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.020 Purpose.**

A. The purpose of this title is to regulate the use of land and improvements by districts in accordance with the city comprehensive plan. These zoning regulations are designed to provide for orderly development, to lessen street congestion, to promote fire safety and public order, to protect the public health and general welfare, to prevent overcrowding, and to stimulate the systematic development of transportation, water, sewer, schools, parks, storm drainage and other public facilities.

B. It is further intended that any financial responsibility of the developer for work to be done on city streets, bounding in close proximity to and/or giving access to the development, which arises out of the provisions of this chapter, be made the subject of a contractual agreement between the developer and the city, and that such contractual agreement shall contain provisions to effectuate other sections of this chapter. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.030 Conformity with regulations required.**

No building or land within the city of shall hereafter be occupied or used and no building or part thereof shall be erected, moved or altered unless in conformity with applicable provisions specified in this title. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.040 Public uses.**

A. Approval Required to Insure Conformity. To insure that public uses and structures conform to the general community pattern and to the regulations governing private uses and development, agencies of the federal government, the state of Washington and its political subdivisions, including the city of Gig Harbor, shall submit plans and receive approvals in conformity with the regulations outlined herein when any activity covered by this title is contemplated in the city. (Ord. 605 § 2, 1991; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.050 Interpretation and application of provisions.**

The provisions of this title shall be the minimum regulations and shall apply uniformly within each district and each class or kind of building, structure, land or water area, except as hereinafter specifically provided. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.060 Conflict with other regulations.**

Whenever the regulations of this title are at variance with the requirements of any other lawfully adopted rule or regulation or ordinance of the city, then the most restrictive of these provisions, or the provision imposing the highest standards as the case may be, shall apply. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.070 Public notice.**

*Repealed by Ord. 702.* (Ord. 652 § 3, 1993; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.01.080 Conformance required – Fence or shrub height.**

A. In order to maintain and preserve safe vision purposes on all corner lots, there shall be no fences, shrubs or other physical obstructions within 20 feet of the apex of the property corner at the intersecting streets, higher than 36 inches above the existing grade.

B. On interior lots a fence not exceeding six feet in height above the existing grade may be located anywhere from the front yard setback line to the rear property line. Within the front yard, a fence not exceeding three feet in height may be constructed to the side yard property lines with provisions for safe vision clearance where a driveway intersects the fronting street.

C. Fences shall not be constructed of plywood or composition sheeting. (Ord. 702 § 3, 1996; Ord. 667 § 2, 1994; Ord. 652 § 2, 1993; Ord. 109A § 3, 1968. Formerly 17.08.010).

**17.01.090**

**17.01.090 Construction trailers – Temporary uses.**

A. Applications for the temporary use of construction trailers are Type 1 project permit applications as defined under GHMC Title 19 and shall be processed accordingly. These permits are available for those who are in the process of constructing a building or buildings, which shall be subject to renewal, to locate a construction trailer or similar portable office on the building lot during the course of construction of the building or buildings. Such permit shall not be issued until after a building permit has been obtained.

B. Construction trailer or portable offices may be used as caretaker's quarters at various job sites which are controlled by other permits of limited time duration. All other types of caretaker quarters must meet the requirements for dwellings.

C. Construction trailers or portable offices used for temporary uses must have an approval on sewage disposal system, water supply, and electrical connection.

D. A temporary use permit may be issued by the planning/building department for a period not to exceed one year; provided, the department, for good cause shown, may renew the permit for an additional six-month period, at which time the temporary use (construction trailer or portable office) and all appurtenances thereto shall be removed from the property.

E. As a condition to the issuance of a temporary permit under the provisions of this section, the owner shall deposit in trust with the city, in cash or its equivalent, an amount as established under the City's Fee Schedule Resolution, to be deposited in a special fund created by this chapter and identified as the "construction trailer or portable office deposit fund," and shall enter into an agreement with the city. Such agreement shall provide, at a minimum, as follows:

1. The applicant agrees to pay to the city all fees, costs, and/or expenses, legal or otherwise, which the city may incur in causing the removal of the construction trailer or portable office, and all its appurtenances left in place beyond the time period approved by the city or used or installed in violation of the ordinances of the city;

2. The applicant agrees that all such fees, costs and/or expenses incurred by the city shall be deducted from the deposit;

3. The applicant agrees to pay to the city such fees, costs, and/or expenses incurred by the city which are in excess of the deposit;

4. The city agrees to refund the deposit at the time of expiration of the permit, in total; pro-

vided the city does not incur such fees, costs, and/or expenses, or shall refund the remainder of the deposit after deduction of such fees, costs, and/or expenses; and

5. The city agrees to provide to the applicant a complete and accurate accounting of all such fees, costs, and/or expenses, if any, incurred by the city.

F. A temporary use permit will be issued by the planning/building department. The fee imposed for the permit is in addition to all other required permits for electrical, plumbing and sewage disposal systems. (Ord. 702 § 5, 1996).

- 17.04.880 Yard.  
 17.04.890 Yard, front.  
 17.04.900 Yard, rear.  
 17.04.910 Yard, side.

**17.04.010 General interpretation.**

For the purposes of this title, certain usages and words herein shall be interpreted as follows:

- A. Words used in the present tense include the future tense;
- B. The singular number includes the plural;
- C. The word "person" includes a legal entity as well as an individual;
- D. The word "lot" includes the words plot, parcel and tract;
- E. The word "shall" signifies a requirement;
- F. The words "used" and "occupy" as applied to any building or land include the words intended, arranged, or designed to be used or occupied;
- G. The word "may" signifies permission and desire;
- H. Where a definition for a word or term is not found in this section, the definition of the word or term as found in the latest edition of Webster's Dictionary shall apply. (Ord. 703 § 26, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.015 Accessory apartment.**

"Accessory apartment" means a residential unit of up to 600 square feet with a functional kitchen, bath, and outside entrance attached to or on the same parcel as a single-family residence in a residential zone. Accessory apartments shall be under the same ownership as the primary residential unit with the owner living on-site in either unit. Accessory apartments shall not be condominiumized or otherwise sold separately. (Ord. 1046 § 1, 2006; Ord. 629 § 1, 1992).

**17.04.017 Accessory uses and structures.**

"Accessory uses and structures" means caretaker dwelling units associated with nonresidential uses, residential garages, sheds, similar outbuildings associated with the principal residential uses on the site and temporary buildings for and during construction. (Ord. 1046 § 2, 2006).

**17.04.020 Administrative official.**

"Administrative official" means a municipal official appointed by the mayor to administer and enforce this title and all other laws, statutes, rules and regulations applicable within the city. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.021 Adult arcade.**

"Adult arcade" means a commercial establishment containing individual viewing areas or booths where, for any form of consideration, including a membership fee, one or more still or motion picture projectors, slide projectors, or other similar image producing machines are used to show films, motion pictures, video cassettes, slides, or other visual representations that are distinguished or characterized by a predominant emphasis on matters depicting, describing, or simulating any specified sexual activities or any specified anatomical areas. (Ord. 743 § 3, 1996).

**17.04.022 Adult cabaret.**

"Adult cabaret" means a nightclub, bar, restaurant, tavern, or other similar commercial establishment, whether or not alcoholic beverages are served, that regularly features adult entertainment. (Ord. 743 § 4, 1996).

**17.04.023 Adult entertainment.**

"Adult entertainment" means:

- A. Any exhibition, performance or dance conducted in an adult entertainment facility where such exhibition, performance or dance is distinguished or characterized by a predominant emphasis on matters depicting, describing, or simulating any specified sexual activities or any specified anatomical areas; or
- B. Any exhibition, performance or dance intended to sexually stimulate any patron and conducted in an adult entertainment facility where such exhibition, performance or dance is performed for, arranged with, or engaged in with fewer than all patrons in the adult entertainment facility at that time, with separate consideration paid, either directly or indirectly, for such performance, exhibition or dance. For purposes of example and not limitation, such exhibitions, performances or dances are commonly referred to as table dancing, couch dancing, taxi dancing, lap dancing, private dancing or straddle dancing. (Ord. 743 § 5, 1996).

**17.04.024 Adult entertainment facility.**

"Adult entertainment facility" means a commercial establishment defined as an adult arcade, adult cabaret, adult motel, adult motion picture theater, adult retail store, or other adult entertainment facility. (Ord. 743 § 6, 1996).

**17.04.255 Computer assembly plants.**

"Computer assembly plants" means those uses which are classified as industry group 357 in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (SICM), 1987 edition or as amended. (Ord. 724 § 3, 1996).

**17.04.260 Conditional use.**

"Conditional use" means a use listed among those classified in any given zone but permitted only after a public hearing by the city and the granting of a conditional use permit imposing such performance standards as will make the use compatible with other permitted uses in the same district. (Ord. 703 § 4, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.261 Contractor's yard.**

"Contractor's yard" is an outdoor storage area used for the storage of equipment or machinery typically used in the construction trades industry. (Ord. 752 § 1, 1997).

**17.04.262 Courier services.**

"Courier services" means those uses which are classified as group 4215 in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (SICM), 1987 edition or as amended. (Ord. 724 § 4, 1996).

**17.04.264 Day care provider, family.**

"Family day care provider" means a state-licensed day care provider as defined in RCW 74.15.020 who regularly provides day care for not more than 12 children in the provider's home in the family living quarters. (Ord. 1046 § 10, 2006; Ord. 703 § 5, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.265 Coffee house.**

"Coffee house" means a restaurant 1 use that serves primarily coffee, tea and other nonalcoholic beverages. (Ord. 1046 § 11, 2006; Ord. 598 § 3, 1991).

**17.04.268 Delicatessen.**

*Repealed by Ord. 1046. (Ord. 598 § 3, 1991).*

**17.04.269 Dense vegetative screen.**

A "dense vegetative screen" consists of a physical buffer which is opaque to a height of six feet and broken to a height of 20 feet. Screening may be achieved through any one or a combination of the following methods:

- A. A solid row of evergreen trees or shrubs.
- B. A solid row of evergreen trees or shrubs planted on an earthen berm.

C. A combination of trees and shrubs and fencing where the amount of fencing does not exceed 50 percent of the lineal distance of the side to be buffered. Ground cover plants which are capable of providing complete ground coverage within three years of planting shall also be provided. (Ord. 652 § 1, 1993).

**17.04.270 Detached buildings.**

"Detached building" means a building surrounded on all sides by open space and not connected to another building or structure except by utilities. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.271 Director.**

"Director" means the director of the department of community development or his/her designated representative. (Ord. 703 § 6, 1996).

**17.04.272 Developed property.**

"Developed property" means a lot or parcel of land upon which a building/buildings is/are located, but which contains insufficient area to be capable of further subdivision in accordance with the Gig Harbor subdivision or short subdivision ordinances (GHMC Title 16), as now or hereafter amended. (Ord. 703 § 7, 1996).

**17.04.275 Distribution facilities.**

"Distribution facilities" means those uses which are classified as group 4212 in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual (SICM), 1987 Edition or as amended. (Ord. 724 § 6, 1996).

**17.04.280 Dock.**

"Dock" means a place or structure that connects with the shore and provides access to a boat vessel from the land. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.285 Drive-through facility.**

"Drive-through facility" means an establishment, as allowed in the zone, that permits customers to receive services or products while remaining in their vehicles. (Ord. 1046 § 13, 2006; Ord. 752 § 5, 1997; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.287 Dwelling, attached.**

"Attached dwelling" means a dwelling that is connected to one or more dwellings by common vertical walls, horizontal floor, or a continuous roof structure. (Ord. 1046 § 14, 2006).

**17.04.288 Dwelling, duplex.**

"Duplex dwelling" means a residential structure with two attached dwelling units and is constructed on a permanent foundation. (Ord. 1046 § 15, 2006).

**17.04.289 Dwelling, fourplex.**

"Four-plex dwelling" means a residential structure with four attached dwelling units and is constructed on a permanent foundation. (Ord. 1046 § 16, 2006).

**17.04.290 Dwelling, multiple-family.**

"Multiple-family dwelling" means a residential building that is designed for or occupied by three or more families living independently of each other in separate but attached dwelling units and is constructed on a permanent foundation. (Ord. 1046 § 17, 2006; Ord. 703 § 8, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.300 Dwelling, single-family.**

"Single-family dwelling" means a residential structure with one dwelling unit that is constructed on a permanent foundation. Single-family dwellings are detached from other single-family dwellings except that accessory apartments may be attached to a single-family dwelling. (Ord. 1046 § 18, 2006; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.301 Dwelling, triplex.**

"Triplex dwelling" means a residential structure with three attached dwelling units and is constructed on a permanent foundation. (Ord. 1046 § 19, 2006).

**17.04.305 Dwelling, mobile/manufactured.**

"Mobile/manufactured dwelling" means a residential unit on one or more chassis for towing to the point of use and designed to be used as a dwelling unit on a year-round basis, and if to be installed, one which bears an insignia by a state or federal regulatory agency indicating that the mobile/manufactured home complies with all applicable construction standards of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's definition of a manufactured home. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.310 Dwelling, two-family.**

*Repealed by Ord. 1046. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).*

**17.04.320 Dwelling unit.**

"Dwelling unit" is one or more rooms with at least one kitchen, that is designed as a unit for occupancy by not more than one family for sleep-

ing and living purposes. Each unit at an assisted living facility or independent living facility shall count as one-third of a dwelling unit (.33) for purposes of calculating density. (Ord. 990 § 1, 2005; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.325 Dwelling, factory-built.**

"Factory-built dwelling" means a structure constructed in a factory of factory assembled parts and transported to the building site in whole or in units which meets the requirements of the International Building Code. The completed structure is not a mobile/manufactured home; it is a detached building that is designed for long-term human habitation exclusively by one family, has complete living facilities and constitutes one dwelling unit. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.326 Entertainment, commercial.**

"Commercial entertainment" means any passive recreational activities including but not limited to movie theaters, performing arts theaters, concert halls, and arcades. (Ord. 1046 § 21, 2006).

**17.04.327 Equipment, heavy.**

"Heavy equipment" means vehicles or machines capable of lifting or altering heavy objects, moving large quantities of earth and/or stone, extracting natural resources, harvesting, planting or maintaining agricultural/forest products, and other vehicles or machines performing large-scale work tasks. Heavy equipment includes, but is not limited to, cranes, bulldozers, earth scrapers, tractors over 80 horsepower, and equipment of a similar nature. (Ord. 1046 § 22, 2006).

**17.04.328 Essential public facilities.**

"Essential public facilities" includes those facilities identified in RCW 36.70A.200 that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities and state or regional transportation facilities as defined in RCW 47.06.140, state and local correctional facilities, solid waste handling facilities, and in-patient facilities including substance abuse facilities, mental health facilities, group homes, and secure community transition facilities as defined in RCW 71.09.020. (Ord. 1046 § 23, 2006).

**17.04.329 Expressive dance.**

"Expressive dance" means any dance which, when considered in the context of the entire performance, constitutes an expression of art, theme, story or ideas, but excluding any dance such as, but not limited to, common barroom type topless danc-

**17.04.432 Legal interest.**

“Legal interest” means the owner of record for the parcel and/or the duly authorized agent for the owner of record. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.433 Land clearing.**

“Land clearing” means the act of removing or destroying trees or groundcover from any undeveloped or partially developed land, public lands, or public right-of-way, except for those forest practices covered under Chapter 76.09 RCW. (Ord. 752 § 3, 1997).

**17.04.434 Light assembly.**

“Light assembly” means the assembly of prefabricated materials or components into a finished product. Included in this definition is product wholesaling and material storage. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.436 Light manufacturing.**

“Light manufacturing” means any premises devoted to the production of a finished or semifinished product and which has minimal nuisance factors such as, but not limited to, noise, light, glare, odors, particulate emission and hazardous wastes. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.438 Living facility, assisted.**

“Assisted living facility” means a multiunit establishment which provides living quarters and a variety of supportive personal care, limited health care, housekeeping, and transportation services to individuals who are unable to live independently due to infirmity of age or physical handicap, but who do not need the medically oriented care of a skilled nursing facility. Individual dwelling units are of a barrier-free design with separate bathroom facilities and a mini-kitchen without range. Communal areas include a dining room in which three meals per day are served, social and activity areas, laundry facilities, and open space. Assisted living facilities are licensed under Chapter 388-110 WAC. (Ord. 990 § 2, 2005).

**17.04.439 Living facility, independent.**

“Independent living facility” means a multiunit establishment which provides living quarters and a variety of social, housekeeping, and transportation services to senior citizens who choose to live in a congregate setting. Individual dwelling units are of a barrier-free design with separate bathroom facilities and may contain a full kitchen, partial kitchen, or no kitchen. Communal areas include a dining

room in which at least one meal per day is served, social and activity areas, laundry facilities, and open space. (Ord. 990 § 3, 2005).

**17.04.440 Loading berth.**

“Loading berth” means an off-street space or berth that is on the same lot with the building it serves and is used for the parking of a vehicle while loading or unloading material or items. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.444 Lodging, level 1.**

“Lodging, level 1” means a single-family residence which provides overnight lodging for guests, and may provide meals for overnight guests, not to exceed five guest rooms. (Ord. 1046 § 32, 2006).

**17.04.445 Lodging, level 2.**

“Lodging, level 2” means an establishment providing sleeping accommodations with a majority of all guest rooms having direct access to the outside without the necessity of passing through the main lobby of the building, with or without food services, and may include conference facilities. (Ord. 1046 § 33, 2006).

**17.04.446 Lodging, level 3.**

“Lodging, level 3” means an establishment providing sleeping accommodations with a majority of all guest rooms having direct access through the main lobby of the building, with or without food services, and may include conference facilities. (Ord. 1046 § 34, 2006).

**17.04.450 Lot.**

“Lot” means an area of land that is described by metes and bounds or recorded plat and is to be used, developed or built upon as a single unit of land. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.455 Lot of record.**

“Lot of record” means a lot, tract or parcel which is defined by a deed recorded as a valid lot in a recorded subdivision with the county auditor and assigned a tax number. (Ord. 703 § 12, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.460 Lot area.**

“Lot area” means all the area within the boundaries of a lot excluding rights-of-way, etc. (see GHMC 17.04.080). (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

## **17.04.710**

### **17.04.710 Sales, level 2.**

“Sales, level 2” means automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, recreational vehicles, boats and trailer sales. (Ord. 1046 § 68, 2006).

### **17.04.711 Sales, level 3.**

“Sales, level 3” means heavy equipment sales and rentals, and including outdoor bulk sales of building and landscaping supplies. (Ord. 1046 § 69, 2006).

### **17.04.712 Sales, retail.**

“Retail sales” means the point of purchase acquisition of small quantities of finished goods or products, excluding motorized vehicles, trailers, manufactured homes and boats, by the ultimate consumer. (Ord. 1046 § 63, 2006; Ord. 880 § 1, 2001; Ord. 703 § 20, 1996. Formerly 17.04.705).

### **17.04.713 Sales, wholesale.**

“Wholesale sales” means the acquisition of finished or semi-finished goods, products or materials by a commercial entity, firm or corporation for eventual distribution to a retail market and which are not subject to the retail sales tax. (Ord. 1046 § 64, 2006; Ord. 703 § 21, 1996. Formerly 17.04.706).

### **17.04.715 Satellite dish antenna.**

“Satellite dish antenna” means a circular or parabolically shaped device of solid or mesh construction, designed and erected for receiving telecommunication signals. A small satellite dish antenna is defined as having a diameter of one meter or less and located within any zoning district or two meters or less within commercial and employment districts. A large satellite dish antenna is defined as having a diameter of greater than one meter in diameter in any residential zone or two meters in diameter in commercial and employment districts. (Ord. 1046 § 67, 2006; Ord. 771 § 7, 1997; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990. Formerly 17.04.710).

### **17.04.716 School, higher educational.**

“Higher educational school” means a public or private postsecondary educational facility. (Ord. 1046 § 70, 2006).

### **17.04.717 School, primary.**

“Primary school” means a public or private Washington State accredited K – 8 school, including accessory playgrounds and athletic fields. (Ord. 1046 § 71, 2006).

### **17.04.718 School, secondary.**

“Secondary school” means a public or private Washington State accredited 9 – 12 school, including athletic fields. (Ord. 1046 § 72, 2006).

### **17.04.719 School, vocational/trade.**

“Vocational/trade school” means a public or private educational facility teaching skills that prepare students for jobs in a trade or occupation. (Ord. 1046 § 73, 2006).

### **17.04.720 Setback, building.**

“Building setback” means the distance between the building line and the nearest boundary to the site or lot, measured at right angles to the boundary. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### **17.04.725 Sexually oriented materials.**

“Sexually oriented materials” means any books, magazines, periodicals or other printed materials, or any photographs, films, motion pictures, video cassettes, slides, or other visual representations that are distinguished or characterized by a predominant emphasis on matters depicting, describing, or simulating any specified sexual activities or any specified anatomical areas. (Ord. 743 § 12, 1996).

### **17.04.730 Sign.**

“Sign” means any device, flag, light, figure, picture, letter, work, message, symbol, plaque, poster or building face that is visible from outside the lot on which it is located and that is designed to inform or attract the attention of the public through visual communication, excluding murals or architectural designs that do not advertise a business, product or service. Signs are subject to all regulations specified in Chapter 17.80 GHMC. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### **17.04.740 Sign area.**

“Sign area” means the entire area within a single, continuous perimeter enclosing the extreme limits of a sign but excluding any structural elements not forming an integral part of the display. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### **17.04.742 Special uses.**

“Special uses” are uses permitted under Chapter 17.65 GHMC that are permitted or conditionally permitted in the underlying zone, but which are temporary and infrequent in nature, lasting seven days or less and occurring not more than twice in any calendar year by any given applicant or at any given site. Special uses include events or promo-

#### 17.04.780

lar improvements of a minor character the construction of which is not regulated by the building code of the city. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.780 Studio apartment.

“Studio apartment” means an apartment with one main living space, a kitchen, a bathroom, and does not have a separate bedroom. (Ord. 783, 1998).

#### 17.04.790 Tank farm.

“Tank farm” means a lot that has one or more tanks, the aggregate volume of which is 10,000 gallons or more, and that contain something other than water. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.795 Tavern.

“Tavern” means an establishment that serves alcoholic beverages as its primary use. (Ord. 1046 § 74, 2006).

#### 17.04.800 Tract.

“Tract” means a parcel of land in single ownership that has not been subdivided into lots in conformance with the applicable laws of the state, county or city. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.805 Tree.

A “tree” shall mean any living woody plant characterized by one main stem or trunk and many branches, and which has a minimum diameter of six inches as measured 54 inches above the ground. (Ord. 752 § 4, 1997).

#### 17.04.830 Travel trailer.

“Travel trailer” means a motor vehicle or portable vehicular structure that is capable of being towed on the highways by a motor vehicle, is designed or intended for casual or short-term human occupancy for travel, recreational or vacation uses, and is identified by a model number, serial number, or vehicle registration number. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.835 Truck garden.

“Truck garden” means a farm producing vegetables for sale. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.837 Undeveloped property.

“Undeveloped property” means a lot or parcel of land upon which no building exists, and which may or may not be of sufficient area so as to be capable of subdivision. (Ord. 703 § 23, 1996).

#### 17.04.840 Use.

“Use” means how land or a building is arranged, designed, occupied or maintained. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.850 Use, principal.

“Principal use” means the primary use of land or a building as distinguished from a secondary or minor use. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.860 Utilities.

“Utilities” includes public or private domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, electric distribution systems, telephone systems, and water storage facilities, excluding wireless communication facilities. (Ord. 1046 § 76, 2006).

#### 17.04.870 Variance.

“Variance” means a relaxation of the requirements of this title with respect to building setback, building height, the size of signs, coverage or parking (but not with respect to use) approved by the city as a Type III permit application. (Ord. 703 § 24, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### 17.04.873 Vehicle wash.

“Vehicle wash” means an area of land and/or a structure used principally for the cleaning, washing, polishing, or waxing of motor vehicles. (Ord. 1046 § 78, 2006).

#### 17.04.875 Warehouse/warehousing.

“Warehouse” or “warehousing” means the storage of goods, products or materials for commercial or industrial facilities within a fully enclosed structure. (Ord. 703 § 25, 1996).

#### 17.04.877 Waterfront view corridor.

“Waterfront view corridor” includes all parcels located between the shoreline of Gig Harbor Bay and either Harborview Drive or North Harborview Drive, excluding parcels located north of or abutting Rust Street (originally named Walnut Street) as shown on the original Arden Addition plat recorded on August 23, 1890. (Ord. 995 § 2, 2005).

#### 17.04.878 Yacht club.

“Yacht club” means a building or group of buildings where members of a boating association hold their meetings and may contain rooms and/or dwelling units available for temporary rental, and may contain a restaurant as allowed in the zone. (Ord. 1046 § 79, 2006).

**17.04.880 Yard.**

“Yard” means a required open space that is on the same lot with the principal use and is unoccupied or unobstructed by any portion of a structure; provided however, that paved terraces, fences, walls, poles, posts, ornaments, furniture and other customary yard accessories may be permitted in any yard subject to height limitations and requirements limiting the obstruction of visibility at intersections. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.890 Yard, front.**

“Front yard” means a yard extending the full length of the front lot line and its depth is measured horizontally at right angles to the front lot line from midpoint of the front lot line to the midpoint of the front building line, except roof eaves, bump-out windows and decks/balconies may encroach up to a maximum of 18 inches into the yard. (Ord. 601 § 1, 1991; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.900 Yard, rear.**

“Rear yard” means a yard extending the full length of the rear lot line and its depth is measured horizontally at right angles to the rear lot line from midpoint of the rear lot line to midpoint of the rear building line, except roof eaves, bump-out windows and decks/balconies may encroach up to a maximum of 18 inches into the yard. (Ord. 601 § 1, 1991; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.04.910 Yard, side.**

“Side yard” means a yard extending from the front yard to the rear yard and its depth is measured horizontally at right angles to the side lot line from the midpoint of the side lot line to the midpoint of the side building line except roof eaves, bump-out windows and decks/balconies may extend up to 18 inches into the yard. (Ord. 601 § 1, 1991; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**Chapter 17.05****DENSITY IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES**

## Sections:

- 17.05.010 Purpose.
- 17.05.020 Requirements.
- 17.05.030 Calculations.
- 17.05.035 Density rounding.
- 17.05.040 Exclusions.

**17.05.010 Purpose.**

The density requirement helps to maintain a consistent and compatible land use pattern in Gig Harbor’s residential neighborhoods. Other purposes of this requirement are to serve the planned housing needs of the city’s residential population and prevent public nuisances that result from a lack of open space and the overutilization of public facilities. (Ord. 951 § 3, 2004).

**17.05.020 Requirements.**

The allowed density, as shown for each residential zone in this title, represents the maximum number of dwelling units that may occupy an acre of land. This maximum number of units may be exceeded only through participation in the planned residential development process (PRD, Chapter 17.89 GHMC). (Ord. 951 § 3, 2004).

**17.05.030 Calculations.**

When determining the allowed density for any given lot in the city, the net buildable land area of the site is used. Net buildable land area, for the purpose of determining the allowed dwelling units for a site, shall be calculated by subtracting areas where building is prohibited or subject to significant restrictions from the gross lot area. The area remaining after these exclusions from the gross lot area represents the net buildable land area. The following shall be deducted from the gross lot area to determine net buildable land area:

A. Sensitive areas including: Type I, II, III and IV wetlands, ravine sidewalls, and bluffs.

B. Public rights-of-way, private streets and access corridors; except as excluded under GHMC 17.05.040.

C. Tidelands. The area of waterfront lots is considered to be the area landward of the line of the ordinary high water mark, regardless of the extent of ownership, or the area landward of the ordinary high water mark along streams. (Ord. 951 § 3, 2004).

## 17.05.035

### 17.05.035 Density rounding.

The allowable number of dwelling units for any given lot of the city shall be calculated by multiplying the net buildable land area by the allowed density in dwelling units/acre. The result of this calculation shall equal the number of dwelling units permitted. If a calculation results in a fractional dwelling unit, the fractional dwelling unit shall be rounded to the nearest whole number. Less than one-half shall be rounded down. Greater than or equal to one-half shall be rounded up.

Example: One and one-half acres times three du/acre equals four and one-half (rounded to five dwelling units). (Ord. 972 § 1, 2004).

### 17.05.040 Exclusions.

The following shall not be deducted from the gross lot area when calculating net buildable land area:

- A. Required setbacks;
- B. Buffers and screening required by design manual standards;
- C. Buffers and screening required by zoning performance standards;
- D. Alleys; and
- E. Wetland buffers. (Ord. 951 § 3, 2004).

Chapter 17.14

LAND USE MATRIX

Sections:

17.14.010 Interpretation of land use matrix.

17.14.020 Land use matrix.

**17.14.010 Interpretation of land use matrix.**

A. The land use matrix in this chapter identifies uses permitted in each individual zoning district. The zoning district is located on the vertical column and the use is located on the horizontal row of this matrix.

B. If a dash appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use is not permitted in that district.

C. If the letter “P” appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use is permitted in that district.

D. If the letter “C” appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use is conditionally permitted subject to the conditional use permit review procedures and criteria specified in Chapter 17.64 GHMC.

E. If a footnote appears in the box at the intersection of the column and the row, the use may be permitted subject to the appropriate review process indicated above and the specific conditions indicated by the corresponding footnote.

F. All applicable requirements shall govern a use whether or not they are cross-referenced in the matrix. To determine whether a particular use is allowed in a particular zoning district and location, all relevant regulations must also be consulted in addition to this matrix. (Ord. 1045 § 1, 2006).

**17.14.020 Land use matrix.**

Uses	PI	R-1	R/D	R-2	RMD	R-3	RB-1	RB-2	DB	B-1	B-2	C-1 <sup>20</sup>	PCD-C	ED <sup>18</sup>	WR	WM	WC	PCD-BP	PCD-NB	MUD
Dwelling, single-family	-	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	C	P <sup>14</sup>	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	-	P	P	P	-	P <sup>14</sup>	P
Dwelling, duplex	-	-	-	P	P	P	-	P	C	P <sup>14</sup>	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	-	P	P	P	-	P <sup>14</sup>	P
Dwelling, triplex	-	-	-	-	P	P	-	P	C	P <sup>14</sup>	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	-	-	C <sup>17</sup>	P	-	P <sup>14</sup>	P
Dwelling, fourplex	-	-	-	-	P	P	-	P	C	P <sup>14</sup>	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	-	-	C <sup>17</sup>	P	-	P <sup>14</sup>	P
Dwelling, multiple-family	-	-	-	-	P	P <sup>6</sup>	-	P	C	P <sup>14</sup>	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	P <sup>14</sup>	P
Accessory apartment <sup>1</sup>	-	C	P	-	P	-	C	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	C	C	P <sup>14</sup>	-	-	-	P	-	P <sup>14</sup>	P
Family day care provider	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Home occupation <sup>2</sup>	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P	-	C	-	-	P	P	P	-	-	-
Adult family home	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P	P
Living facility, independent	-	-	-	C	-	P	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P
Living facility, assisted	-	-	-	C	-	P	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P
Nursing facility, skilled	-	-	-	C	-	P	C	C	C	P	C	C	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P
Hospital	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	C	C	-	C	-	-	-	C	-	-
School, primary	P	C	P	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	-
School, secondary	P	C	P	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	-
School, higher educational	P	C	-	C	-	C	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	-
School, vocational/trade	P	C	-	C	-	C	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	-
Government administrative office	P	C	P	C	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	P	P	P	P	P
Public/private services	P	C	-	C	-	C	C	C	C	P	C	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	P	P
Religious worship, house of	-	C	P <sup>5</sup>	C	P <sup>5</sup>	C	C	C	C	P	-	C	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P/C <sup>15</sup>
Museum	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	C	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Community recreation hall	P	-	P	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	C	C	P	P	-	-	-	P	P	-
Yacht club	-	-	-	-	-	C	C	C	C	-	C	C	P	-	-	C	P	-	-	-

17.14.020

Uses	PI	R-1	RLD	R-2	RMD	R-3	RB-1	RB-2	DB	B-1	B-2	C-1 <sup>20</sup>	PCD-C	ED <sup>18</sup>	WR	WM	WC	PCD-BP	PCD-NB	MUD
Clubs and lodges	-	-	P	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	C	C	P	P	-	-	-	P	P	-
Parks	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	C	C	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Essential public facilities	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Utilities	P	C	P	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	C	C	P	C	C	C	C	P	P	P
Lodging, level 1	-	C	-	C	-	P	P	P	P	P	C	C	-	-	C	C	C	-	-	P
Lodging, level 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	C	-	-	P
Lodging, level 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	C	-	-	P
Personal services	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P
Professional services	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P
Product services, level 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	P
Product services, level 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	P <sup>16</sup>
Sales, level 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	C <sup>7,8</sup>	-	P	P	P	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	P <sup>13</sup>	P
Sales, level 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sales, level 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sales, ancillary	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	-	P	P	P	P	-	-	P	P	-	-
Commercial child care	-	-	C	-	C	-	C	C	C	-	-	P	-	C	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recreation, indoor commercial	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	C	P	-	P	P	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P
Recreation, outdoor commercial	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	C	C	-	P <sup>10</sup>	P	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P
Entertainment, commercial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	P
Automotive fuel-dispensing facility	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	P	-
Vehicle wash	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parking lot, commercial	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C <sup>19</sup>	-	-	-
Animal clinic	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P <sup>9</sup>	-	P	P	-	P	-	-	-	P	-	P
Kennel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Adult entertainment facility <sup>3</sup>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Restaurant 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	C <sup>8</sup>	P	P	P	P	P	P	-	-	C <sup>12</sup>	P	-	P	P
Restaurant 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	P	P
Restaurant 3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	P	P
Tavern	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	P	P	P	-	-	-	P	-	-	-
Drive-through facility	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	C	C	P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Marina	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-
Marine sales and service	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-
Marine boat sales, level 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-
Marine boat sales, level 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	P	P	-	-	-
Ministorage	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	C	C	P	C	-	-	-	-	-	P
Industrial, level 1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	C	C	-	C	P	-	P	-	-	-	P	-	P
Industrial, level 2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	P	-	-	-	P	-	-
Marine industrial	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	P	-	-	-	P <sup>11</sup>	C	-	-	-

Uses	PI	R-1	RLD	R-2	RMD	R-3	RB-1	RB-2	DB	B-1	B-2	C-1 <sup>20</sup>	PCD-C	ED <sup>18</sup>	WR	WM	WC	PCD-BP	PCD-NB	MUD
Wireless communication facility <sup>4</sup>	C	C	C	C	C	C	P	P	C	P	C	P	P	P	C	C	C	P	P	-
Accessory uses and structures	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

- <sup>1</sup> Accessory apartments requiring conditional use permits are subject to the criteria in GHMC 17.64.045.
- <sup>2</sup> Home occupations are subject to Chapter 17.84 GHMC.
- <sup>3</sup> Adult entertainment facilities are subject to Chapter 17.58 GHMC.
- <sup>4</sup> Wireless communication facilities are subject to Chapter 17.61 GHMC.
- <sup>5</sup> Houses of religious worship shall be limited to parcels not greater than five acres.
- <sup>6</sup> Multiple-family dwellings shall be limited to no more than eight attached dwellings per structure in the R-3 district.
- <sup>7</sup> Sales, level 1 uses shall be limited to food stores in the RB-1 district.
- <sup>8</sup> See GHMC 17.28.090(G) for specific performance standards of restaurant 1 and food store uses in the RB-1 zone.
- <sup>9</sup> Animal clinics shall have all activities conducted indoors in the DB district.
- <sup>10</sup> Drive-in theaters are not permitted in the B-2 district.
- <sup>11</sup> Marine industrial uses in the WM district shall be limited to commercial fishing operations and boat construction shall not exceed one boat per calendar year.
- <sup>12</sup> Coffeehouse-type restaurant 1 uses shall not exceed 1,000 square feet in total size in the WM district.
- <sup>13</sup> Sales, level 1 uses shall be limited to less than 7,500 square feet per business in the PCD-NB district.
- <sup>14</sup> Residential uses shall be located above a permitted business or commercial use.
- <sup>15</sup> Houses of religious worship on parcels not greater than 10 acres are permitted uses in the MUD district; houses of religious worship on parcels greater than 10 acres are conditionally permitted uses in the MUD district.
- <sup>16</sup> Auto repair and boat repair uses shall be conducted within an enclosed building or shall be in a location not visible from public right-of-way and adjacent properties.
- <sup>17</sup> Only one triplex dwelling or one fourplex dwelling is conditionally permitted per lot in the WM district.
- <sup>18</sup> Planned unit developments (PUDs) are conditionally permitted in the ED district.
- <sup>19</sup> Commercial parking lots in the WC district shall be related to shoreline uses.
- <sup>20</sup> Junkyards, auto wrecking yards and garbage dumps are not allowed in the C-1 district.

(Ord. 1045 § 1, 2006).

**17.15.010**

**Chapter 17.15**

**PUBLIC-INSTITUTIONAL DISTRICT**

**Sections:**

- 17.15.010 Intent and definitions.
- 17.15.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.15.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.15.040 Site plan.
- 17.15.050 Minimum development standards.
- 17.15.060 Maximum height of structures.
- 17.15.070 Parking and loading facilities.
- 17.15.080 Signs.
- 17.15.090 Performance standards.
- 17.15.100 Hours of operation.

**17.15.010 Intent and definitions.**

A. The public-institutional district is intended to provide for the siting and maintenance of publicly owned facilities and institutions which could not be reasonably sited in any other district.

B. "Public facilities" are defined in RCW 36.70A.030(12) as streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks and recreational facilities and schools. The term "public facilities," as used in this chapter, shall mean any use, activity or facility which is owned and operated by the city of Gig Harbor, the Peninsula School District, Pierce County or any incorporated city within Pierce County and the state of Washington, including any office of the state of Washington.

C. For existing facilities, the PI district shall be applied accordingly. For new facilities, the PI district shall be applied in conjunction with an application for site plan review. (Ord. 1046 § 80, 2006; Ord. 706 § 1, 1996).

**17.15.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the PI district. (Ord. 1045 § 3, 2006).

**17.15.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses conditionally permitted in the PI district. (Ord. 1045 § 5, 2006).

**17.15.040 Site plan.**

Before a building permit will be issued in the PI district, the site plan review process as specified in Chapter 17.96 GHMC shall be followed. (Ord. 706 § 1, 1996).

**17.15.050 Minimum development standards.**

In a PI district, the minimum requirements are as follows:

Use	Lot Width	Front Yard	Rear Yard	Side Yard	Coverage
Admin. Facilities	100	25	30	15	60% max
Maintenance Facilities and Storage	100	35	50	15	70% max
Waste Water Treatment Plants	100	50	50	25	60% max
Schools	None Specified	50	50	50	60% max
Fire Stations	100	35	50	25	60% max
Community Centers	100	25	30	20	60% max
Parks and Open Space	None Specified				

Any yard abutting a residential development shall be required to maintain a dense vegetated screen not less than 50 feet. (Ord. 706 § 1, 1996).

**17.15.060 Maximum height of structures.**

In a PI district, all buildings and structures shall not exceed a height of 35 feet, except as provided for under Chapter 17.62 GHMC, Height Restriction Area, and except as provided under GHMC 17.99.390(A)(3). (Ord. 975 § 19, 2004; Ord. 706 § 1, 1996).

**17.15.070 Parking and loading facilities.**

In a PI district, parking and loading on-site shall be provided in connection with any permitted or conditional use as specified in Chapter 17.72 GHMC. Parking is not permitted in the side yards. Parking in front and rear yards is permitted; provided, that a minimum landscape buffer equal to one-half the required yard is provided. In rear yards, a dense vegetative screen shall be provided between the parking area and any adjacent residence. (Ord. 706 § 1, 1996).

**17.15.080 Signs.**

In a PI district, signs may be allowed in conjunction with any permitted use and are subject to the provisions of Chapter 17.80 GHMC. (Ord. 706 § 1, 1996).

**17.15.090 Performance standards.**

In a PI district, the performance standards are as follows:

**Chapter 17.20**

**MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (R-2)**

Sections:

- 17.20.010 Intent.
- 17.20.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.20.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.20.040 Development standards.
- 17.20.060 Maximum height of structures.
- 17.20.070 Design.

**17.20.010 Intent.**

An R-2 district is intended to allow for a moderate density of land use that is greater than is permitted in an R-1 district but less than is permitted in an R-3 district, where suitable facilities such as streets, water, sewer and storm drainage are available. An R-2 district provides a transition between a higher density residential district in order to preserve the primarily residential character of existing lower density residential areas. (Ord. 710 § 9, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.20.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the R-2 district. (Ord. 1045 § 15, 2006).

**17.20.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses conditionally permitted in the R-2 district. (Ord. 1045 § 17, 2006).

**17.20.040 Development standards.**

In an R-2 district, the minimum requirements are as follows:

A. Minimum lot area for short plats <sup>1</sup>	7,000 sq. ft./dwelling unit
B. Minimum lot width <sup>1</sup>	50'
C. Minimum front yard <sup>2</sup>	25'
D. Minimum side yard	7'
E. Minimum rear yard	25'
F. Maximum site coverage	40% of the total lot area
G. Maximum density <sup>3</sup>	6 dwelling units/acre

<sup>1</sup>A minimum lot area is not specified for subdivisions of five or more lots. The minimum lot width shall be 0.7 percent of the lot area, in lineal feet.

<sup>2</sup>In the case of a corner lot, the owner of such lot may elect any property line abutting on a street as the front property line; provided, such choice does not impair corner vision clearance for vehicles and shall not be detrimental to adjacent properties as

determined by the planning and public works directors. The other property line abutting a street shall be deemed the side property line. An undersized lot or parcel shall qualify as a building site if such lot is a lot of record.

<sup>3</sup>A maximum density of up to 7.8 dwelling units per acre may be permitted within a planned residential development, pursuant to Chapter 17.89 GHMC.

(Ord. 710 § 12, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990. Formerly 17.20.050).

**17.20.060 Maximum height of structures.**

In an R-2 district, all buildings and structures shall not exceed 35 feet, except as provided for under Chapter 17.62 GHMC, Height Restriction Area, and as provided for under GHMC 17.99.390(A)(3), 17.99.510(A)(2) and 17.99.510(B). (Ord. 975 § 26, 2004; Ord. 710 § 14, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.20.070 Design.**

All structures shall conform to the design standards defined for single-family dwellings as provided in GHMC 17.99.490. Nonresidential development shall conform to all nonresidential design standards defined in Chapter 17.99 GHMC. (Ord. 975 § 27, 2004).

## Chapter 17.21

**PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (RMD)**

## Sections:

- 17.21.010 Intent.
- 17.21.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.21.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.21.040 Performance standards.

**17.21.010 Intent.**

The intent of the planned community development medium density residential district is to:

A. Provide for greater population densities to facilitate high quality affordable housing, a greater range of lifestyles and income levels.

B. Provide for the efficient delivery of public services and to increase residents' accessibility to employment, transportation and shopping.

C. Serve as a buffer and transition area between more intensively developed areas and lower density residential areas. (Ord. 747 § 2, 1997).

**17.21.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the RMD district. (Ord. 1045 § 19, 2006).

**17.21.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses conditionally permitted in the RMD district. (Ord. 1045 § 21, 2006).

**17.21.040 Performance standards.**

A. Density. The minimum base density is five and the maximum is eight dwelling units per acre. Additional density may be allowed using either of the following options:

1. Bonus Density Option. A bonus density of up to 30 percent over the base may be permitted, based upon the following allocations:

a. Thirty percent of the development site is common open space, which must be contiguous or greater than one acre in area (plus five percent).

b. A pedestrian trail system is provided within the common open space area, consistent with the adopted trails plan per the land use map (plus 10 percent).

c. A minimum 35 percent of the required common open space is improved as an active recreational area (plus 10 percent). Active recreational areas shall include, but not be limited to:

i. Clearly defined athletic fields and/or activity courts.

ii. Recreation center or community facility.

d. Additional common open space is provided between the development and adjacent residential zones, uses or developments (plus five percent bonus maximum at a ratio of one percent density bonus per five percent open space increase).

2. Density Credit Transfers. A transfer of density credits may be applied from one residential district within the PCD to the residential medium density district up to a maximum of 16 dwelling units per acre. Density credit transfers shall be as provided for in the density credit transfer section, in Chapter 17.59 GHMC. Density credit transfers may be used in conjunction with bonus density options to achieve the maximum allowable density of 16 dwelling units per acre.

**B. General.**

1. Single-family attached dwelling units must have individual private yards or courts enclosed by a wall, berm or dense landscaping. Easements shall be required for all zero lot line developments to facilitate access from the adjoining lot for necessary maintenance and repair activities.

2. Minimum yards (from the property line). Multifamily or multiple units of single-family on one parcel:

- a. Front, 10 feet.
- b. Side, 30 feet.
- c. Rear, 30 feet.

Single-family on individual parcels: as defined in GHMC 17.99.290.

3. Maximum Height. The maximum height is 45 feet, except as provided under GHMC 17.99.390(A)(3).

4. Maximum lot area coverage: Sixty-five percent, excluding driveways, private walkways and similar impervious surfaces. Impervious surface coverage of individual parcels may exceed the 65 percent maximum when included within a subdivision; provided, that the overall impervious surface coverage of the subdivision does not exceed 65 percent.

5. Landscaping. Landscaping shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 17.78 GHMC and GHMC 17.99.250, except that buffer dimensions shall be reduced to 10 feet when the proposed use is adjacent to a similar use or zone which includes a platted buffer of equal or greater width.

6. Circulation/Roads/Streets. Residential development which provides pedestrian linkages to and within common open space trails systems may be waived from the requirements in the city's

**17.24.010**

public works standards for public sidewalks, curbs and gutters within the residential development, in whole or in part, upon approval of the public works director.

7. Design. All development shall comply with the standards of Chapter 17.99 GHMC.

8. Signage. Signage must comply with the requirements of Chapter 17.80 GHMC. (Ord. 977 §§ 1, 2, 3, 2004; Ord. 975 § 28, 2004; Ord. 747 § 2, 1997).

**Chapter 17.24**

**MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3)**

Sections:

- 17.24.010 Intent.
- 17.24.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.24.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.24.040 Site plans.
- 17.24.050 Development standards.
- 17.24.060 Maximum height of structures.
- 17.24.070 Design.

**17.24.010 Intent.**

An R-3 district is intended to provide areas suitable for multiple-family dwellings and to serve as a buffer and transition between more intensively developed areas and residential properties of a lower density. An R-3 district is suitable in areas which are served by municipal services and in areas readily accessible to freeway access. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.24.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the R-3 district. (Ord. 1045 § 23, 2006).

**17.24.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses conditionally permitted in the R-3 district. (Ord. 1045 § 25, 2006).

**17.24.040 Site plans.**

Before a building permit will be issued in an R-3 district, the site plan review process as specified in Chapter 17.96 GHMC shall be followed. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.24.050 Development standards.**

In an R-3 district, the minimum lot requirements are as follows:

A. Minimum lot area for short plats <sup>1</sup>	5,400 sq. ft./dwelling unit
B. Minimum lot width <sup>1</sup>	50'
C. Minimum front yard <sup>2</sup>	20'
D. Minimum side yard	7'
E. Minimum rear yard	25'
F. Maximum site coverage	60% of the total lot area
G. Maximum density <sup>3</sup>	8 dwelling units/acre

<sup>1</sup>A minimum lot area is not specified for subdivisions of five or more lots. The minimum lot width shall be 0.7 percent of the lot area, in lineal feet.

<sup>2</sup>In the case of a corner lot, the owner of such lot may elect any property line abutting on a street as the front property line; provided, such choice does not impair corner vision clearance for vehicles and shall not be detrimental to adjacent properties as determined by the planning and public works directors.

<sup>3</sup>A maximum density of up to 10.4 dwelling units per acre may be permitted within a planned residential development, pursuant to Chapter 17.89 GHMC.

(Ord. 710 § 17, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.24.060 Maximum height of structures.**

In an R-3 district, all buildings and structures shall not exceed 35 feet in height except as provided for under Chapter 17.62 GHMC, Height Restriction Area, and as provided under GHMC 17.99.510(A)(2) and 17.99.510(B). (Ord. 975 § 29, 2004; Ord. 710 § 18, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.24.070 Design.**

All single-family and duplex structures shall conform to the design standards defined for single-family development in Chapter 17.99 GHMC. All multifamily and nonresidential development shall conform to all applicable design standards of Chapter 17.99 GHMC. (Ord. 975 § 30, 2004).

## **Chapter 17.28**

### **RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS DISTRICT (RB-1)**

#### Sections:

- 17.28.010 Intent.
- 17.28.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.28.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.28.040 Site plan.
- 17.28.050 Minimum development standards.
- 17.28.060 Maximum height of structures.
- 17.28.070 Parking and loading facilities.
- 17.28.080 Signs.
- 17.28.085 Design.
- 17.28.090 Performance standards.

#### **17.28.010 Intent.**

An RB-1 district is intended to provide a mix of residential uses with certain specified business, personal and professional services. It is also intended to serve as a buffer between high intensity commercial and lower density residential uses. The regulations and restrictions in an RB-1 district are intended to protect and preserve residential uses while permitting business uses characterized principally by professional and consultive services or executive and administrative offices, compatible with single-family residential development. To this extent, nonresidential structures should be limited in total gross floor area per lot in order to minimize the impact of bulk and scale to residential neighborhoods. (Ord. 710 § 19, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.28.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the RB-1 district. (Ord. 1045 § 27, 2006).

#### **17.28.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses conditionally permitted in the RB-1 district. (Ord. 1045 § 29, 2006).

#### **17.28.040 Site plan.**

Before a building permit will be issued in the RB-1 district, the site plan review process as specified in Chapter 17.96 GHMC shall be followed. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

## 17.28.050

### 17.28.050 Minimum development standards.

In an RB-1 district, the minimum lot requirements are as follows:

	Residential	Nonresidential
A. Minimum lot area (sq. ft.)	7,200	15,000
B. Minimum lot width	70'	70'
C. Minimum front yard setback <sup>1</sup>	20'	20'
D. Minimum rear yard setback <sup>1</sup>	25'	15'
E. Minimum side yard setback <sup>1</sup>	7'	10'
F. Maximum impervious lot coverage	50%	60%
G. Minimum street frontage	20'	50'
H. Density	4 dwelling units/acre	
I. Maximum gross floor area	N/A	5,000 sq. ft. per lot

<sup>1</sup>If the RB-1 district is located in the historic district defined in Chapter 17.99 GHMC, the setbacks defined in GHMC 17.99.310 and 17.99.320 shall apply. Single-family dwellings in any RB-1 district outside the historic district are subject to the setback standards of GHMC 17.99.290.

J. Any yard abutting a single-family residence shall be required to maintain a 30-foot-wide dense vegetated screen. (Ord. 982 § 1, 2005; Ord. 975 § 31, 2004; Ord. 716 § 3, 1996; Ord. 710 § 21, 1996; Ord. 601 § 1, 1991; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.28.060 Maximum height of structures.

In an RB-1 district, all buildings and structures shall not exceed 35 feet in height except as provided for under Chapter 17.62 GHMC, Height Restriction Area, and as provided under GHMC 17.99.390(A)(3), 17.99.510(A)(2) and 17.99.510(B). (Ord. 975 § 32, 2004; Ord. 710 § 22, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.28.070 Parking and loading facilities.

In an RB-1 district, parking and loading on private property shall be provided in connection with any permitted or conditional use as specified in Chapter 17.72 GHMC. Parking is not permitted in the side yards. Parking in front and rear yards is permitted; provided, that a minimum landscaped buffer of 10 feet is provided. In rear yards, a dense vegetative screen shall be provided between the parking area and any adjacent residence. (Ord. 710 § 22, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.28.080 Signs.

In an RB-1 district, signs may be allowed in conjunction with any permitted use and are subject to the provisions of Chapter 17.80 GHMC. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.28.085 Design.

Development in the RB-1 district shall conform to the design and development standards contained in Chapter 17.99 GHMC. (Ord. 975 § 33, 2004).

### 17.28.090 Performance standards.

In an RB-1 district, the performance standards are as follows:

A. Exterior Mechanical Devices. Air conditioners, heating, cooling and ventilating equipment, pumps and heaters and all other mechanical devices shall be screened.

B. Landscaping. Landscaping is required and shall be installed in conformance with Chapter 17.78 GHMC and GHMC 17.99.250, and/or conditions of approval of discretionary applications required by this title; such landscaping shall be maintained in a neat manner. In no event shall such landscaped areas be used for storage of materials or parking of vehicles.

C. Outdoor Storage of Materials. The outdoor storage of materials, including but not limited to lumber, auto parts, household appliances, pipe, drums, machinery or furniture, is permitted as an incidental or accessory activity of a permitted use or the principal feature of a conditional use. Such storage shall be screened by a wall, fence, landscaping or structure from surrounding properties and streets.

D. Outdoor Lighting. Outdoor lighting shall conform to the standards of GHMC 17.99.350 and 17.99.460. Such lighting shall be shielded so that the direct illumination shall be confined to the property boundaries of the light source. Ground-mounted floodlighting or light projection above the horizontal plane is prohibited between midnight and sunrise.

E. Trash Receptacles. Trash receptacles shall be screened from view. Screening shall be complementary to building design and materials.

F. Design. Development in the RB-1 district shall conform to the design and development standards contained in Chapter 17.99 GHMC.

G. Restaurant 1 and Food Stores. In addition to all other performance standards, restaurant 1 and food store uses shall be situated on the street level in an office building and not exceed 800 square feet in floor area. No outside sales or storage are

allowed. The hours of operation are limited to 16 hours per day. (Ord. 1045 § 30, 2006; Ord. 975 § 34, 2004; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### Chapter 17.30

#### RESIDENTIAL AND BUSINESS DISTRICT (RB-2)

##### Sections:

- 17.30.010 Intent.
- 17.30.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.30.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.30.040 Site plans.
- 17.30.050 Development standards.
- 17.30.060 Site coverage.
- 17.30.070 Maximum building height.
- 17.30.080 Parking.
- 17.30.090 Signs.
- 17.30.100 Loading.
- 17.30.110 Performance standards.

##### **17.30.010 Intent.**

The RB-2 district is intended to provide a mix of medium density residential uses with certain specified business, personal and professional services. It is intended to serve as a transitional buffer between high intensity commercial areas and lower intensity residential areas. The RB-2 zone is similar in construction to the RB-1 zone while allowing a higher percentage of impervious coverage and multifamily residential development. Furthermore, the RB-2 zone would serve to minimize impacts to adjacent residential uses by limiting general operational impacts of a use to that portion of the site between the structure(s) and the fronting road. (Ord. 554 § 1A, 1989).

##### **17.30.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the RB-2 district. (Ord. 1045 § 32, 2006).

##### **17.30.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the RB-2 district. (Ord. 1045 § 34, 2006).

##### **17.30.040 Site plans.**

Prior to the issuance of a building permit in the RB-2 district, the site plan review process specified under this title shall be completed to the satisfaction of the city. (Ord. 554 § 1D, 1989).

##### **17.30.050 Development standards.**

In an RB-2 district, development standards shall be satisfied for all new and redeveloped uses requiring site plan review:

- A. Minimum lot area: 12,000 square feet;
- B. Minimum lot width: 70 feet;
- C. Front yard setback: 20 feet;

## 17.30.060

D. Side yard setback: eight feet;

E. Rear yard setback: 15 feet;

F. Any nonresidential yard abutting an existing residential use or zone: 40 feet with dense vegetative screening. Easements not having dense vegetative screening are not included;

G. Maximum density: Eight dwelling units per acre permitted outright; 12 dwelling units per acre allowed as a conditional use. (Ord. 954 § 3, 2004; Ord. 710 § 26, 1996; Ord. 554 § 1E, 1989).

### 17.30.060 Site coverage.

Impervious site coverage in an RB-2 district shall be limited as follows:

A. Fifty-five percent site coverage is permitted outright.

B. Seventy percent site coverage is conditionally allowed, subject to the following:

1. For every one percent increase in site coverage, an additional 0.5 feet of buffer shall be provided between the use and adjacent single-family residential use or zone;

2. Increased buffering shall consist of one of the following:

a. Undisturbed native vegetation which meets the definition of a dense vegetative screen,

b. Appropriate landscape vegetation consisting of a mixture of coniferous and broadleaf evergreen species with minimum planting height of six feet and capable of providing a dense vegetative screen within three years of planting,

c. As an alternative to paragraph b of this subdivision, the opaque portion of the screen may consist of a weather-resistant wood fence of six feet in height, constructed along the property line.

C. Buffer vegetation shall be maintained for the life of the project. Dead, diseased or dying vegetation may be removed; provided, that replanting of vegetation of a like or similar species in size and area coverage shall be accomplished within six months from removal. (Ord. 554 § 1F, 1989).

### 17.30.070 Maximum building height.

In an RB-2 district, all buildings and structures shall not exceed 35 feet except as provided for under Chapter 17.62 GHMC, Height Restriction Area, and as provided under GHMC 17.99.390(A)(3) and 17.99.510(A)(2) and (B). (Ord. 975 § 35, 2004; Ord. 710 § 27, 1996; Ord. 554 § 1G, 1989).

### 17.30.080 Parking.

In an RB-2 district, parking on private property shall be provided in connection with any permitted or conditional use as specified in Chapter 17.72

GHMC. Where the parcel abuts a residential use or zone, parking and vehicle access areas shall be located between the fronting road and the structure(s); provided, that where site characteristics or design preclude locating parking and access as described, that an additional 10 feet of buffering shall be required. (Ord. 554 § 1H, 1989).

### 17.30.090 Signs.

In an RB-2 district, signs may be allowed in conjunction with any permitted use and are subject to the provisions of Chapter 17.80 GHMC. (Ord. 554 § 1I, 1989).

### 17.30.100 Loading.

In an RB-2 district, off-street loading facilities shall be provided in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 17.72 GHMC. (Ord. 554 § 1J, 1989).

### 17.30.110 Performance standards.

In an RB-2 district, performance standards are as follows:

A. Exterior Mechanical Devices. Air conditioners, heating, cooling and ventilating equipment, pumps and heaters and all other mechanical devices shall be screened.

B. Landscaping. Landscaping is required and shall be installed in conformance with Chapter 17.78 GHMC and as provided under GHMC 17.99.250 and/or by conditions of approval of discretionary applications required by this title; such landscaping shall be maintained in a neat manner. In no event shall such landscaped areas be used for storage of materials or parking of vehicles.

C. Outdoor Storage of Materials. The outdoor storage of materials, including but not limited to lumber, auto parts, household appliances, pipes, drums, machinery or furniture, is permitted as an incidental or accessory activity of a permitted use or the principal feature of a conditional use. Such storage shall be screened by a wall, fence, landscaping or structure from surrounding properties and streets.

D. Outdoor Lighting. Outdoor lighting shall conform to the standards of GHMC 17.99.350 and 17.99.460. Such lighting shall be shielded so that the direct illumination shall be confined to the property boundaries of the light source. Ground-mounted floodlighting or light projection above the horizontal plane is prohibited between midnight and sunrise. Temporary outdoor lighting intended to advertise a temporary promotional event shall be exempt from this requirement.

E. Trash Receptacles. Trash receptacles shall be screened from view. Screening shall be complementary to building design and materials.

F. Design. Development in the RB-2 district shall conform to the design and development standards contained in Chapter 17.99 GHMC. (Ord. 975 § 36, 2004; Ord. 710 § 28, 1996; Ord. 554 § 1K, 1989).

**Chapter 17.31**

**DOWNTOWN BUSINESS DISTRICT (DB)**

Sections:

- 17.31.010 Intent.
- 17.31.020 Permitted uses.
- 17.31.030 Conditional uses.
- 17.31.040 Site plans.
- 17.31.050 Minimum lot requirements.
- 17.31.060 Minimum building setback requirements.
- 17.31.070 Maximum impervious coverage by all buildings.
- 17.31.075 Maximum gross floor area.
- 17.31.080 Maximum height of structures.
- 17.31.090 Parking/loading.
- 17.31.100 Signs.
- 17.31.110 Performance standards.

**17.31.010 Intent.**

A. The purpose of the DB district is to:

- 1. Provide for an area that offers a broad range of goods and services for the citizens of Gig Harbor;
- 2. Promote and enhance services and activities which cater to visitors to the city; and
- 3. Maintain the traditional scale and character of downtown Gig Harbor.

B. The standards for development in this chapter are intended to allow uses which are:

- 1. Primarily conducted within enclosed buildings except for parking, dining areas and newsstands;
- 2. Protect views; and
- 3. Allow for commercial developments which do not adversely affect residences through excessive noise or bothersome activities. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.31.020 Permitted uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses permitted in the DB district. (Ord. 1045 § 36, 2006).

**17.31.030 Conditional uses.**

Refer to Chapter 17.14 GHMC for uses conditionally permitted in the DB district. (Ord. 1045 § 38, 2006).

**17.31.040 Site plans.**

Before a building permit will be issued in a DB district, the site plan review process as specified in Chapter 17.96 GHMC shall be followed. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

## 17.31.050

### 17.31.050 Minimum lot requirements.

In a DB district, the minimum lot area is 6,000 square feet, and the minimum lot width is 50 feet. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.31.060 Minimum building setback requirements.

In a DB district, the setbacks defined in GHMC 17.99.310 and 17.99.320 apply; provided, however, that where a DB district abuts a residential district, a building setback shall be 20 feet minimum, and the space so created shall be landscaped to screen the commercial uses from the abutting residential district. (Ord. 975 § 37, 2004; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.31.070 Maximum impervious coverage by all buildings.

In the DB district, the maximum impervious coverage is 80 percent. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.31.075 Maximum gross floor area.

In the DB district, the maximum gross floor area per building is 6,000 square feet. Multiple buildings on the same site shall be separated by a non-penetrated fire wall as defined in the International Fire Code except that a single six-foot opening in the fire wall separating structures is permissible; provided, that each structure has an outside customer entrance accessible to the street. Each structure shall be designed to stand independent of other structures on the site (i.e., the addition or removal of any one building on a site will not require structural attachments or modifications to any other building on the site). (Ord. 995 § 5, 2005).

### 17.31.080 Maximum height of structures.

In the DB district, the height provisions of GHMC 17.99.510 apply. (Ord. 975 § 38, 2004; Ord. 710 § 29, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.31.090 Parking/loading.

In the DB district, parking and loading facilities on private property shall be provided in connection with any permitted or conditional use as specified in Chapter 17.72 GHMC, off-street parking and loading requirements. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.31.100 Signs.

In the DB district, signs may be allowed in conjunction with any permitted use and are subject to the provisions of Chapter 17.80 GHMC. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.31.110 Performance standards.

In a DB district, performance standards are as follows:

A. Exterior Mechanical Devices. Air conditioners, heating, cooling and ventilating equipment, pumps and heaters and all other mechanical devices shall be screened.

B. Landscaping. Landscaping is required and shall be installed in conformance with Chapter 17.78 GHMC and GHMC 17.99.250, and/or conditions of approval of discretionary applications required by this title. Such landscaping shall be maintained in a neat manner. In no event shall such landscaped areas be used for storage of materials or parking of vehicles.

C. Outdoor Storage of Materials. The outdoor storage of materials, including but not limited to lumber, auto parts, household appliances, pipes, drums, machinery or furniture, is permitted as an incidental or accessory activity of a permitted use or the principal feature of a conditional use. Such storage shall be screened by a wall, fence, landscaping or structure from surrounding properties and streets.

D. Outdoor Display of Merchandise. The outdoor display of merchandise is limited to the area immediately along the building frontage a maximum distance of 12 feet from the building. Outdoor displays of merchandise on public sidewalks or rights-of-way shall be regulated per Chapter 12.02 GHMC.

E. Outdoor Lighting. Outdoor lighting shall conform to the standards of GHMC 17.99.350 and 17.99.460. Such lighting shall be shielded so that the direct illumination shall be confined to the property boundaries of the light source. Ground-mounted floodlighting or light projection above the horizontal plane is prohibited between midnight and sunrise. Temporary outdoor lighting intended to advertise a temporary promotional event shall be exempt from this requirement.

F. Trash Receptacles. Trash receptacles shall be screened from view. Screening shall be complementary to building design and materials.

G. Design. Development in the DB district shall conform to the design and development standards contained in Chapter 17.99 GHMC. (Ord. 975 § 39, 2004; Ord. 710 § 30, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

formities) if a sensitive zone or use identified in GHMC 17.58.040(A) locates within 500 feet of that adult entertainment facility after the date that adult entertainment facility has located within the city in accordance with the requirements of this chapter. (Ord. 743 § 17, 1996).

## Chapter 17.59

### PLANNED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TRANSFER OF DENSITY CREDITS OPTION

#### Sections:

- 17.59.010 Intent.
- 17.59.020 Applicability.
- 17.59.030 Procedure.

#### **17.59.010 Intent.**

The intent of the density credit transfer option is to permit greater flexibility in the allocation of residential density within a planned community development designation without exceeding the maximum density buildout as planned for. The density transfer credit option may provide for higher densities in areas posing the fewest environmental constraints and which also have available access to public transportation. To this end, desired goals of the density credit transfer option are to:

A. Protect areas identified as having environmentally sensitive areas or features by minimizing or avoiding impacts associated with residential development.

B. Supply quality affordable housing while providing access opportunities to local employment areas.

C. Promote more efficient provision of public services.

D. Locate higher density residential development in areas which are capable of supporting more intense uses. (Ord. 747 § 6, 1997).

#### **17.59.020 Applicability.**

A. Density credit transfers are limited to the planned community designation and the mixed use designation of the city of Gig Harbor comprehensive plan (Nov., 1994). Density credit transfers may be applied from one residential district to another residential district. A density credit consists of one residential dwelling unit.

B. Property which is constrained by critical areas or wetlands as defined under the Gig Harbor Municipal Code shall receive full density credit for those portions of the site which are undevelopable.

C. Density credits may be transferred in whole or in fractions. Development rights associated with a density credit are considered real property and are subject to any legal requirements as applicable to other real property. (Ord. 747 § 6, 1997).

**17.59.030**

**17.59.030 Procedure.**

A. An owner of real property within the planned community district residential low or residential medium may apply for a density credit transfer either as a donor or receiver of the density credit. A donor relinquishes density from property under the donor's ownership to the receiver's property. The receiver of density credits may apply the increased density to land under the receiver's ownership, consistent with the city of Gig Harbor comprehensive plan and the city zoning code. The following process applies to the transfer and receipt of density credits:

1. The applicant must submit documentation to the city which provides the following:

a. The location, site area and specific development right(s) permitted under the comprehensive plan and zoning code which the property owner proposes to transfer, the base density, inclusive of previously transferred density, and the resultant change in density on the donor's property.

b. The location and site area of the land to which the density credit is transferred to, including the projected density credit resulting from the transfer, the base density and the resultant change in density on the receiver's property.

B. Upon receipt of the completed application for density credit transfer, the planning/building department shall review the density credit transfer proposal to assure that it is consistent with the planned community development district designation to which it applies and the general density as stated.

C. Upon approval of the planning department and the city attorney, the applicant/property owner shall file with the Pierce County auditor a legally sufficient document which effectively accomplishes the following:

1. A covenant on the lands affected by the density credit transfer which contains deed restrictions reflecting the transfer and its resultant conditions to private ownership and future development of the land.

2. A deed for the development rights so affected shall be assigned an assessor's tax parcel number, including a legal description of the real property from which density credits are to be donated from and a legal description of the real property to which such density credits are to be transferred to.

A copy of the executed legal instrument, bearing the Pierce County auditor's file number, shall be provided to the planning department and the city attorney prior to the issuance of any development permit for the affected properties.

Density credit transfers are exempt from the permit processing procedures in GHMC Title 19 and are processed simultaneous with any Type III permit application. (Ord. 747 § 6, 1997).

## 17.64.010

B. The property or area proposed for exclusion from the height restriction area map does not currently possess a view of Gig Harbor Bay, Mt. Rainier or the Puget Sound Narrows;

C. The gradient of the land within 100 feet of the property or area does not have a slope of five percent or greater toward Gig Harbor Bay, Mt. Rainier or the Puget Sound Narrows;

D. That views from adjacent properties will not be adversely affected. (Ord. 710 § 62, 1996).

## Chapter 17.64

### CONDITIONAL USES

#### Sections:

- 17.64.010 Intent.
- 17.64.015 Complete application.
- 17.64.020 Procedure.
- 17.64.030 General conditions.
- 17.64.040 Review criteria.
- 17.64.045 Review criteria for accessory apartments.
- 17.64.046 Conditional use permits for review criteria for wireless communication facilities.
- 17.64.050 Expiration.
- 17.64.060 Transfer of a conditional use permit.
- 17.64.070 Revocation of a conditional use permit.
- 17.64.080 *Repealed.*
- 17.64.090 *Repealed.*

#### **17.64.010 Intent.**

Certain uses, because of their unusual size, infrequent occurrence, special requirements, possible safety hazards or detrimental effect on surrounding properties, are classified as conditional uses. These uses may be allowed in certain use districts by a conditional use permit granted by the hearing examiner, subject to the procedures established in Chapter 17.10 GHMC. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.64.015 Complete application.**

An application for a conditional use permit is considered complete upon submittal of the information as required under GHMC 17.96.050(B) through (D) and (L), including the written statement of justification for granting the variance pursuant to the requirements of GHMC 17.64.040. This is in addition to the application requirements of GHMC 19.02.002 for a Type III application. Seven copies of all information required shall be submitted along with the processing fee. (Ord. 725 § 8, 1996; Ord. 710 § 63, 1996).

#### **17.64.020 Procedure.**

Any use that requires a conditional use permit shall be processed in accordance with the following procedures:

A. Application. An application for a conditional use permit may be filed by the property owner, lessee of the property with more than a month-to-month tenancy or authorized agent of the property owner. The application shall be submitted in writing and be accompanied by the required plans and

data. These applications shall be submitted to the planning department for transmittal to the hearing examiner with analysis and recommendation.

B. Investigation. The planning director shall make an investigation to determine whether a proposed conditional use would be in accordance with the comprehensive plan and this chapter, whether the use would be injurious to the public health, safety or welfare, and whether the use would be detrimental to other properties in the vicinity.

C. Granting or Denial. The decision may include special restrictions or conditions deemed necessary or desirable in furthering the intent of the ordinance pertaining to the proposed development.

D. Conditions. The conditions may:

1. Stipulate the exact location of uses or structures as a means of minimizing hazards or property damage;

2. Require special structural features, equipment or site treatment;

3. Increase requirements, standards or criteria over the minimum established by this title. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.64.030 General conditions.**

In considering whether to grant conditional uses, the hearing examiner shall be satisfied that the minimum standards set for uses specified in this title will be met. In addition, the examiner shall consider the criteria listed in this section and the standards as set forth in this chapter. The examiner may require the applicant to submit whatever reasonable evidence may be needed and may stipulate additional conditions to protect the public interest. The burden of proof rests with the applicant. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.64.040 Review criteria.**

Each determination granting or denying a conditional use permit shall be supported by written findings of fact showing specifically wherein all of the following conditions are met:

- A. That the use which the conditional use permit is applied for is specified by this title as being conditionally permitted within, and is consistent with the description and purpose of the zone district in which the property is located;

- B. That the granting of such conditional use permit will not be detrimental to the public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare, will not adversely affect the established character of the surrounding neighborhood, and will not be injurious to the property or improvements in such vicinity and/or zone in which the property is located;

- C. That the proposed use is properly located in relation to the other land uses and to transportation and service facilities in the vicinity; and further, that the use can be adequately served by such public facilities and street capacities without placing an undue burden on such facilities and streets;

- D. That the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the proposed use and all yards, open spaces, walls and fences, parking, loading, landscaping and other such features as are required by this title or as needed in the opinion of the examiner.

For wireless communication facilities the criteria in GHMC 17.64.046 shall apply. (Ord. 771 § 15, 1997; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.64.045 Review criteria for accessory apartments.**

When reviewing a conditional use request for an accessory apartment, the hearing examiner shall consider the following guidelines:

- A. The required parking space for the accessory apartment is placed behind the primary structure or is paved with grass-block pavers to avoid an expansive area of hard surface;

- B. The accessory apartment is attached to or placed at least six feet behind the primary structure;

- C. The design of the accessory apartment is incorporated into the primary unit's design with matching materials, colors, window style and roof design;

- D. The entrance to the accessory apartment is oriented away from the view of the street or is designed to appear as a secondary entrance to the primary unit (e.g., garage entrance or service porch entrance);

- E. Utilities for the accessory apartment shall be metered separate from the primary dwelling unit;

- F. The accessory apartment and the primary unit conforms to all other building and zoning code requirements. (Ord. 710 § 64, 1996).

#### **17.64.046 Conditional use permits for review criteria for wireless communication facilities.**

- A. Type of Permit. Applications for conditional use permits for wireless communications and broadcast and relay towers shall be processed as a Type III permit.

- B. Criteria for Approval. Applications for conditional use permits for wireless communication facilities may be approved if the applicant demonstrates all of the following:

## 17.64.050

1. That there will be no injury to the neighborhood or other detriment to the public welfare;

2. That there is a need for the proposed tower to be located in or adjacent to the residential area, and which shall include documentation on the procedures involved in the site selection and an evaluation of alternative sites and existing facilities on which the proposed facility could be located or co-located;

3. The feasibility of future consolidated use of the proposed facility or co-location with other public utility facilities;

4. The facility shall be designed to be as least intrusive as practicable, including, but not limited to, the exterior treatment of the facility so as to be harmonious with the character of the surrounding neighborhood, the use of landscaping and privacy screening to buffer the facility and activities on the site from surrounding properties and that any equipment that is not enclosed shall be designed and located on the site to minimize impacts related to noise, light and glare onto surrounding properties. (Ord. 771 § 16, 1997).

### 17.64.050 Expiration.

Any conditional use permit granted by the hearing examiner shall expire if not exercised within one year of the date of approval. If a use or activity authorized by such permit is abandoned or discontinued for a continuous period of one year, it may not be reestablished unless authorized in accordance with the provisions of this chapter. A request for extension of the one-year time limit may be considered by the hearing examiner, providing that the request is in writing and is received no less than 30 days prior to the expiration date. No additional extensions shall be granted. An extension shall be valid for a period not to exceed one year. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.64.060 Transfer of a conditional use permit.

A conditional use permit shall be transferable; provided, that the transferee complies with the conditions of the permit. If at any time the conditional use no longer complies with the conditions of the permit, the owner shall be declared in violation of this title and shall be subject to its penalties. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.64.070 Revocation of a conditional use permit.

Following a public hearing by the hearing examiner, a conditional use permit may be revoked for one or more of the following reasons:

A. That the approval was obtained by fraud or that erroneous information was presented by the applicant;

B. That the use for which approval was granted has not been exercised;

C. That use is being exercised contrary to the conditions of approval, or in violation of any statute, ordinance, law or regulation. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.64.080 Appeal of the examiner's decision on a conditional use permit.

*Repealed by Ord. 796. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).*

### 17.64.090 General criteria.

*Repealed by Ord. 710. (Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).*

vegetation within the designated landscape or buffer area. (Ord. 975 § 67, 2004; Ord. 710 § 76, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.78.060 Requirements for residential landscaping.**

##### **A. Perimeter Areas.**

1. Notwithstanding other regulations found in this chapter, perimeter areas shall be landscaped. The required width of perimeter areas to be landscaped shall be at least the depth of the required yard ~~(or) setback area~~. Areas to be landscaped shall be covered with live plant materials which will ultimately cover 75 percent of the ground area, within three years. One deciduous tree a minimum of two-inch caliper or one six-foot evergreen or three shrubs which should attain a height of three and one-half feet within three years shall be provided for every 500 square feet of the area to be landscaped.

2. A minimum of 40 percent of the required plantings shall be evergreen trees a minimum of six feet in height for properties located within the boundaries of the height overlay district referenced in Chapter 17.62 GHMC. Trees shall be of a species that will ultimately grow to the height of the planned building. In the selection of trees and shrubs, consideration should be given to overall aesthetic impacts at maturity.

B. Buffer Areas. All residential plats shall have a minimum 25-foot buffer consisting of a dense vegetated screen, shall be required along the perimeters of the plat, and the buffer shall be established as a covenant on the final plat. The screening may be achieved through any one or a combination of the following methods:

1. A solid row of evergreen trees or shrubs;
2. A solid row of evergreen trees and shrubs be planted on an earthen berm;
3. A combination of trees or shrubs and fencing where the amount of fence does not exceed 50 percent of the lineal distance of the side to be buffered as well as other plant materials, planted so that the ground will be covered within three years;
4. Use of existing native vegetation which meets the definition of dense vegetative screen.

C. Parking Areas. Parking areas shall be landscaped subject to the standards for parking lots found in Chapter 17.72 GHMC and subject to the standards of GHMC 17.99.330. (Ord. 975 § 68, 2004; Ord. 652 § 6, 1993; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.78.070 Requirements for nonresidential uses.**

##### **A. Perimeter Areas.**

1. Notwithstanding other regulations found in this chapter, perimeter areas shall be landscaped. The required width of perimeter areas to be landscaped shall be the required yard or setback area or a total area equivalent to the required yards. Areas to be landscaped shall be covered with live plant materials which will ultimately cover 75 percent of the ground area within three years. One deciduous tree of a minimum of two-inch caliper or one six-foot high evergreen tree or three shrubs which will attain a height of three and one-half feet within three years shall be provided for every 300 square feet of area to be landscaped.

2. A minimum of 40 percent of the required plantings shall be evergreen trees a minimum of six feet in height for properties located within the boundaries of the height overlay district referenced in Chapter 17.62 GHMC. Trees shall be of a species that will ultimately grow to the height of the planned building.

B. Buffer Areas. Where a development subject to these standards is contiguous to a residential zoning district, the zone transition standards of GHMC 17.99.180 shall be met. Where a nonresidential development abuts a residential development in the same zone, then that required perimeter area shall be landscaped the full width of the setback areas as follows:

1. A solid screen of evergreen trees or shrubs;
2. A solid screen of evergreen trees and shrubs be planted on an earthen berm an average of three feet high along its midline;
3. A combination of trees or shrubs and fencing where the amount of fence does not exceed 50 percent of the lineal distance of the side to be buffered as well as other plant materials, planted so that the ground will be covered within three years.

##### **C. Areas Without Setbacks.**

1. In those areas where there is no required front yard setback or where buildings are built to the property line, development subject to this chapter shall provide a street tree at an interval of one every 20 feet or planter boxes at the same interval or some combination of trees and boxes, or an alternative.

2. Street trees shall be a minimum caliper of two inches and be a species approved by the city and installed to city standards. Planter boxes shall be maintained by the property owners and shall be of a type approved by the city.

commission who will place notice of intent on the planning commission's agenda. The planning commission shall then formulate a comprehensive use plan for the area described in the notice of intent, to become effective upon the annexation of said area, pursuant to RCW 35.13.177. (Ord. 192 § 3, 1974; Ord. 109A § 24, 1968).

**17.88.040 Comprehensive use plan – Hearings.**

The city council shall hold two hearings upon the proposed comprehensive plan, as provided in RCW 35.13.178, and after giving of notice as therein provided. (Ord. 192 § 4, 1974; Ord. 109A § 24, 1968).

**17.88.050 Withdrawal of intent to petition.**

If the petitioners for annexation are not satisfied with the council's proposed classification of the property to be annexed, then said petitioners may withdraw their notice of intent to petition for annexation by so requesting in writing to the city clerk's office. (Ord. 192 § 5, 1974; Ord. 109A § 24, 1968).

**17.88.060 District designation determination – Petition.**

Whenever an ordinance is enacted annexing property to the city pursuant to a petition for annexation which did not request the determination of a zone prior to the enactment of the ordinance annexing the property to the city and the council chooses not to request a prior determination of zone classification any such property so annexed shall be deemed to be included in the zoning map as being in the R-1 residential district. Within 60 days following annexation, the planning commission shall hold a public hearing to determine the best application of this title to the annexed territory. Following the hearing, the commission shall make its recommendation to the city council for the zoning of the area. (Ord. 192 § 6, 1974; Ord. 109A § 24, 1968).

**Chapter 17.89**

**PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ZONE (PRD)**

Sections:

- 17.89.010 Intent of the planned residential zone (“PRD”).
- 17.89.020 Where PRDs are permitted and acceptable parcel characteristics.
- 17.89.030 Permit application procedures.
- 17.89.040 Contents of complete PRD application.
- 17.89.050 Types of uses permitted.
- 17.89.060 Development and design standards.
- 17.89.070 Criteria for approval of preliminary PRD application.
- 17.89.080 Criteria for approval of final PRD application.
- 17.89.090 Roads.
- 17.89.100 Density bonus.
- 17.89.110 Open space.
- 17.89.120 Minor and major amendments of the final plan.

**17.89.010 Intent of the planned residential zone (“PRD”).**

The intent of the PRD zone is to allow opportunity for more creative and imaginative residential projects than generally possible under strict application of the zoning regulations in order that such projects shall provide substantial additional benefit to the general community. It is further intended to preserve unique or sensitive physical features, such as steep slopes, public views, retention of natural vegetation and to provide more open space and recreational amenities, for residents of the development and the general public, than would be available under conventional land development practices. Additionally, it is intended to promote more economical and efficient use of land and a unified design concept for residential development. (Ord. 867 § 1, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.89.020 Where PRDs are permitted and acceptable parcel characteristics.**

A. PRDs may be permitted in all districts zoned residential; the Waterfront Millville (WM) and Waterfront Residential (WR) zones.

B. PRDs shall not be allowed on any parcels less than two acres in size, excluding tidelands, unless one of the following findings are made, in addition to the criteria for preliminary PRD approval in this chapter:

1. An unusual physical, natural resource or topographical feature of importance exists on the

## 17.89.030

site or in the neighborhood which can be conserved and still leave the applicant reasonable use of the land by the use of a PRD; or

2. The property or its neighborhood has a historical character of importance to the community that will be protected by use of a PRD. (Ord. 867 § 2, 2001; Ord. 710 § 82, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.89.030 Permit application procedures.

A. Type of Permit. A preliminary PRD application shall be processed according to the procedures set forth in GHMC Title 19 for Type III-A project permit applications. Final PRD applications shall be processed according to the procedures in GHMC Title 19 for Type III-A project permit applications.

B. Expiration of PRD. Within five years of the date of the preliminary PRD approval, an application shall be submitted for final PRD approval, otherwise, the preliminary PRD approval shall expire. Building construction on the project must commence within 12 months from the date of the final approval; otherwise, preliminary PRD approval becomes null and void.

C. Concurrent Applications. Unless an applicant for preliminary plat approval requests otherwise, a preliminary plat shall be processed simultaneously with a PRD, to the extent that procedural requirements allow simultaneous processing. If an applicant requests that a preliminary PRD application be processed prior to the time a preliminary plat application is submitted, the preliminary PRD application shall not be considered to be vested, i.e., such application shall not be considered under the subdivision, zoning or other land use control ordinances in effect at the time the fully completed application for a preliminary PRD has been submitted to the city.

D. Phasing. If a proposed PRD is to be developed in phases, the entire PRD shall be portrayed in the preliminary PRD application, and each phase shall individually receive final PRD approval within the time periods established in subsection B of this section.

E. Design Review. The applicant shall submit an application for design review approval concurrent with the preliminary PRD application. The hearing examiner shall be present at the design review board hearings as necessary to ensure coordination of decisionmakers as allowed under GHMC 19.01.002(C).

F. Extensions. Knowledge of the expiration date and initiation of a request for an extension of time is the responsibility of the applicant. Requests

for an extension of time must be submitted to the planning department at least 30 days prior to the expiration of PRD approval. The planning department shall schedule the request for extension for public hearing before the hearing examiner. One extension is the maximum to be granted and it shall be for no more than one year and the PRD may be subject to any new or amended regulations, requirements, policies or standards which are adopted after the original date of approval, unless 50 percent or more of the on-site work has been completed. (Ord. 867 § 3, 2001; Ord. 710 § 83, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

### 17.89.040 Contents of complete PRD application.

A. In addition to the applicable requirements of GHMC 19.02.002, a complete application for preliminary PRD shall consist of the following information:

1. An environmental checklist or impact statement, as may be applicable, pursuant to GHMC Title 18;

2. The title and location of the proposed development, together with the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the recorded owners of the land and the applicant, and if applicable, the name, address and telephone number of any architect, planner, designer or engineer responsible for the preparation of the plan, and of any authorized representative of the applicant;

3. A written description addressing the scope of the project, gross acreage, the nature and size in gross floor area of each use and the total amount of land in square feet to be covered by impervious surfaces;

4. A vicinity map showing site boundaries and existing roads and accesses within and bounding the site, as well as adjacent parcels and uses;

5. A topographic map delineating contours, existing and proposed, at two-foot intervals and which locates and classifies existing streams, wetlands, steep slopes and other natural features and/or critical areas;

6. Plans drawn to a scale no smaller than one inch equals 30 feet showing the proposed location and size of proposed uses, buildings, buffer areas, yards, open spaces and landscaped areas;

7. A circulation plan drawn to a scale acceptable to the public works director illustrating all access points for the site and the proposed size and location of driveways, streets and roads that have immediate impact on public rights-of-way;

8. Utility, drainage and stormwater runoff plans;

9. A plan of all proposed landscaping including buffers and screening to be used as well as identification of areas of significant vegetation proposed to be retained;

10. A statement explaining how the proposed PRD is consistent with and implements the city of Gig Harbor comprehensive plan, the designation under the comprehensive plan, current zone classification, and desired zone classification;

11. A narrative describing how the proposed PRD provides substantial additional benefit to the citizens of the city of Gig Harbor (the benefit accruing as a result of implementation of the PRD process as opposed to following the development standards of the underlying zone) and how it is proposed the additional amenities and benefits should apply to the percentage of additional density and/or height being requested;

12. A map of the area, with area proposed for rezone outlined in red; and

13. Two sets of mailing labels for all property owners whose parcels are within 300 feet of any border of the subject property, as provided by the Pierce County auditor's office.

B. In addition to the applicable requirements of GHMC 19.02.002, a complete application for final PRD approval shall consist of the following information:

1. Two sets of mailing labels for all property owners whose parcels are within 300 feet of any border of the subject property, as provided by the Pierce County auditor's office;

2. A complete application for design review as required under GHMC 17.98.040. (Ord. 951 § 4, 2004; Ord. 867 § 4, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.89.050 Types of uses permitted.**

The following uses are permitted in a PRD:

A. Those primary, accessory and conditional uses permitted in the underlying zoning district;

B. Other residential and low impact retail uses may be located within the PRD, if a rezone application is submitted concurrently with the preliminary PRD application, and all of the following criteria are satisfied, in addition to the rezone criteria in Chapter 17.100 GHMC:

1. Such uses constitute 10 percent or less of the proposed project;

2. Such uses are an integral component of the planned residential development;

3. Such uses are compatible with any existing residential uses; and

4. Such uses are consistent with the Gig Harbor comprehensive plan. (Ord. 867 § 5, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.89.060 Development and design standards.**

A. The performance standards of the underlying zoning district may be varied in a PRD, subject to the criteria in this chapter, only as follows:

1. Lot Area and Lot Width. Lot area and width requirements may be reduced where the site plan is such that light, air and privacy are provided. Cluster housing is supported.

2. Setbacks. Structures located on the perimeter of the PRD shall be set back in accordance with the front yard setbacks of the underlying zone.

3. Impervious Surface Coverage. Impervious surface coverage of individual parcels may exceed the percentage of impervious surface coverage allowed in the underlying zone; provided, that overall impervious surface coverage of the PRD does not exceed the percentage permitted by the underlying zone.

4. Height. Building height may exceed the maximum permitted by code; provided, that the design protects the views and privacy of properties inside and outside of the project but in no case shall the maximum height exceed 35 feet in R-1 and R-2 districts. Variances from the height limits as provided in the City Height Restriction Area Map, as adopted by Chapter 17.62 GHMC, shall not be allowed. For perimeter buildings exceeding the maximum height of the underlying zone, the distance between such buildings and the perimeter of the PRD shall not be less than the front yard setback of the underlying zone plus five feet for each foot of excess height.

B. The performance standards which may not be modified or altered in a PRD are:

1. Shoreline regulations when the property is located in an area under the jurisdiction of the Gig Harbor shoreline master program;

2. Standards pertaining to development in environmentally sensitive areas;

3. Regulations pertaining to nonconforming uses;

4. Standards pertaining to screening around outdoor storage areas;

5. Total coverage by impervious surface coverage; and

6. Height restrictions as identified on the adopted City of Gig Harbor Height Restriction Area Map and shoreline master program. (Ord. 867 § 6, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.89.070 Criteria for approval of preliminary PRD application.**

A. Applicants for a preliminary PRD application shall demonstrate that, with the exception of the sections of the code from which the applicant intends to vary (as allowed by GHMC 17.89.060), the proposed PRD satisfies all applicable code requirements, and is compatible with surrounding properties. In addition, applicants must make the following showing:

1. Landscaping and site plans showing the location of proposed open space or parks, road layout and proposed buffering of buildings, parking, integrated pedestrian circulation, loading and storage areas, all approved under the design review process;

2. Identification of unique characteristics of the subject property proposed to be retained and how those characteristics qualify for density and/or height bonus under GHMC 17.89.100;

3. Identification of unique characteristics of the proposed use(s) and how those characteristics qualify for density and/or height bonus;

4. The proposed relationship and arrangement of buildings and open spaces as they relate to various uses within or adjacent to the PRD approved under the design review process;

5. Measures proposed to mitigate visual impact of the PRD upon the surrounding area and approved under the design review process;

6. Identification of any extraordinary public improvements proposed for acceptance of ownership by the city in connection with the planned development and that qualify for the density and/or height bonus under GHMC 17.89.100;

7. Identification of any unique natural features of the property proposed for acceptance of ownership by the city for preservation, and that qualify for the density and/or height bonus under GHMC 17.89.100;

8. Identification of any unique historic or cultural features of the property and surrounding neighborhood proposed for acceptance of ownership by the city for preservation and that qualify for density and/or height bonus; and

9. Identification of any proposed recreational opportunities in excess of those normally required of a subdivision and a description of how they qualify for density and/or height bonus.

B. In addition to the above, the PRD may only be approved if the city finds that all of the following criteria are satisfied:

1. The director of public works and the decisionmaker finds that the site access, proposed on-site circulation and off-street parking meet all pub-

lic works standards and makes adequate provision for roads, streets, alleys and other public ways. Streets and sidewalks, existing and proposed, must be suitable and adequate to carry anticipated traffic within the proposed PRD and in the vicinity of the PRD;

2. The director of public works and the decisionmaker finds that the PRD makes adequate provision for all public utilities, including, but not limited to, water, sewer and stormwater drainage. Water, sewer and stormwater facilities, existing and proposed, must be suitable and adequate to provide service within the proposed PRD and in the vicinity of the PRD;

3. The PRD is consistent with the comprehensive plan;

4. The PRD accomplishes, by the use of permitted flexibility and variation in design, a development that is better than that resulting from traditional development, and benefiting the general public as well as the residents of the PRD. Net benefit to the city may be demonstrated by one or more of the following:

a. Placement, type or reduced bulk of structures, or

b. Interconnected usable open space, or

c. Recreational facilities, or

d. Other public facilities, or

e. Conservation of natural features, or

f. Aesthetic features and harmonious design, or

g. Energy efficient site design or building features;

5. The PRD results in no greater burden on present and projected public utilities and services than would result from traditional development;

6. The fire marshal and the decisionmaker find that adequate provision has been made for fire protection;

7. The perimeter of the PRD is compatible with the existing land use or property that abuts or is directly across the street from the subject property. Compatibility includes but is not limited to size, scale, mass and architectural design;

8. One or more major circulation point(s) functionally connected to a public right-of-way as required by the director of public works, or the fire marshal, or any other appropriate decisionmaker;

9. Open space within the PRD is an integrated part of the project rather than an isolated element of the PRD and is accessible to the general public;

10. The design is compatible with and responds to the existing or intended character, appearance, quality of development and physical

characteristics of the subject property and immediate vicinity;

11. Each phase of the proposed PRD, as it is planned to be completed, contains the required parking spaces, open space, roads, recreation space, utilities and utility area and landscaping necessary for creating and sustaining a desirable and stable environment.

C. If the PRD requires a rezone(s), such rezone(s) shall be approved before or concurrently with the PRD is approval. (Ord. 867 § 7, 2001; Ord. 710 § 84, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.89.080 Criteria for approval of final PRD application.**

A. Applicants for a final PRD application shall demonstrate that all of the following criteria have been satisfied:

1. All features and amenities identified in the preliminary PRD have been constructed and/or are retained or improved;

2. The city public works director has documented that all conditions imposed on the preliminary PRD requiring public works department approval have been constructed or improved to the satisfaction of the director;

3. The city fire marshal has documented that all conditions imposed on the preliminary PRD requiring fire code approval have been constructed (or per the fire marshal's discretion will be constructed pursuant to a subsequent permit) to the satisfaction of the fire marshal;

4. The city planning director has documented that all conditions imposed on the preliminary PRD requiring planning department approval have been constructed to the satisfaction of the director;

5. Findings must be made that the preliminary PRD (and/or preliminary plat) conforms to all terms of preliminary PRD approval, and that the PRD meets the requirements of this chapter and all other applicable codes and state laws.

B. The applicant shall provide a bond or other financial assurance acceptable to the hearing examiner to ensure that any improvements made in the common open space will be completed. The city shall release the bond or financial assurance when the improvements have been completed in accordance with the preliminary PRD.

C. As a condition of approval of the final PRD, and before any permits are issued for the property, the applicant shall submit to the city any covenants, deeds and/or homeowners' association bylaws, or other documents guaranteeing maintenance, construction and common fee ownership, if applicable,

of open space, community facilities, and all other commonly owned and operated property. These documents shall be reviewed and approved as to form by the city attorney to ensure that they comply with the requirements of this chapter prior to final PRD approval. Such documents and conveyances shall be recorded with the county auditor as a condition of any final PRD approval. (Ord. 867 § 8, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.89.090 Roads.**

All roads shall be consistent with the adopted policies and standards of the city of Gig Harbor public works construction standards for public roads. (Ord. 867 § 9, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.89.100 Density bonus.**

A. The density may be increased in a PRD over that permitted in the underlying zone but only if: (1) consistent with the underlying comprehensive plan designation for the property; and (2) the density increase will not exceed 30 percent over the density allowed in the underlying zone. Density calculations shall be made as set forth in Chapter 17.05 GHMC.

B. Density bonuses may be allowed only as follows:

##### **1. Open Space.**

a. Satisfaction of the standards in GHMC 17.89.110 for open space; and

b. Provision of open space exceeding by at least 30 percent of the minimum required by the design review manual or the existing zoning code (whichever is greater); or at least 30 percent more than the level of service standards for open space and active recreational areas in the capital facilities element of the adopted Gig Harbor comprehensive plan: 10 percent increase;

2. Preservation of Natural Features. Preservation of a desirable natural feature that would not otherwise be preserved such as, but not limited to, an unregulated wetland, stream corridor, unique geological feature, substantial over story vegetation: 10 percent increase;

3. Preservation of Scenic Vistas. Preservation of a scenic vista corridor(s) within and off-site and accessible to the general public rather than private property owners: 10 percent increase;

4. Design of Stormwater Treatment System as Amenity. A stormwater treatment (retention/detention) facility is also designed as a visually aesthetic and physically accessible amenity for the enjoyment of the public: 10 percent increase. (Ord. 951 § 5, 2004; Ord. 867 § 10, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.89.110 Open space.**

In order to be approved, a preliminary PRD application must demonstrate that all of the following performance standards are satisfied:

A. Common open space shall comprise at least 30 percent of the gross area of the PRD, and shall be used as a recreational, park or environmental amenity for collective enjoyment by occupants of the development. Common open space shall not include public or private streets, driveways, parking areas or the required yards for buildings or structures; provided, however, that up to 30 percent of the required open space may be composed of open space on contiguous privately owned properties reserved by easement or covenant to assure that the open space will be permanent.

B. No naturally submerged lands on site will be counted as open space unless explicitly allowed under GHMC 17.89.100, Density bonus.

C. At least 50 percent of the common open space area must be usable for active or passive recreation, and which is also not utilized as a utility improvement or structure.

D. Common open space may contain such structures and improvements as are necessary and appropriate for the out-of-doors enjoyment of the residents of the PRD.

E. Common open space associated with density bonus must be freely accessible to the general public, identified on the face of the plat, and clearly identified by on-site signage.

F. All common open space must be unique to the project, and may only be credited a single time and to a single project. Such open space may also include a proportionate contribution that is a portion of a city-approved off-site mitigation.

G. Land shown in the final development plan as common open space, and landscaping and/or planting contained therein, shall be permanently maintained by and conveyed to one of the following:

1. An association of owners shall be formed and continued for the purpose of maintaining the common open space. The association shall be created as an association of owners under the laws of the state and shall adopt and propose articles of incorporation or association and bylaws, and adopt and improve a declaration of covenants and restrictions on the common open space that are acceptable to the city in providing for the continuing care of the space. No common open space may be put to a use not specified in the final development plan unless the final development plan is first amended to permit the use. No change of use may be considered as a waiver of any of the covenants limiting the use of common open space area, and all rights

to enforce these covenants against any use permitted are expressly reserved to the city as well as the owners.

2. A public agency which agrees to maintain the common open space and any buildings, structures or other improvements, which have been placed upon it.

H. Common open space shall be suitably improved for its intended use, except when it contains natural features worthy of preservation which may be left unimproved. The buildings, structures and improvements to be permitted in the common open space are those appropriate to the uses which are authorized for the common open space. (Ord. 867 § 11, 2001; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

**17.89.120 Minor and major amendments of the final plan.****A. Minor Amendments.**

1. A minor amendment to the final PRD is a Type I permit application and shall be processed as provided in GHMC Title 19.

2. Minor amendments are those which may affect the precise dimensions or siting of building (i.e., lot coverage, height, setbacks) but which do not affect the basic character or arrangement and number of buildings approved in the final PRD, nor the density of the development or the amount and quality of open space and landscaping.

3. In addition to the permit application requirements set forth in GHMC 19.02.002, a complete application for a minor amendment shall consist of the following:

- a. All plan sheets or pages, or document sheets or pages which reflect changes proposed, or that are affected by such changes.

**B. Major Amendments.**

1. Major amendments are Type III-A permit applications and shall be processed in accordance with GHMC Title 19.

2. Major amendments are those which substantially change the character, basic design, density, open space or other requirements and conditions of the site plan.

3. In addition to the permit application requirements set forth in GHMC 19.02.002, a complete application for a major amendment shall consist of the following:

- a. A complete application packet as required under GHMC 17.96.050.

- b. A complete application packet as required by GHMC 17.98.040 and the design manual.

- c. An amended environmental checklist, and addendums to all environmental documents

affected by the proposed change including the traffic impact analysis.

C. Concurrent Processing of Applications. A minor PRD application may be processed concurrent with a building permit application. If an application for a major amendment is submitted, no building or other permit associated with such major PRD amendment shall issue until all review proceedings required under GHMC Title 19 for a major PRD amendment are completed and all necessary approvals obtained. (Ord. 867 § 13, 2001; Ord. 710 § 86, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990. Formerly 17.89.130).

## Chapter 17.90

### PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

#### Sections:

- 17.90.010 Intent of the planned unit development zone ("PUD").
- 17.90.020 Where PUDs are permitted and acceptable parcel characteristics.
- 17.90.030 Permit application procedures.
- 17.90.040 Contents of a complete preliminary PUD application.
- 17.90.050 Types of uses permitted.
- 17.90.060 Development and design standards.
- 17.90.070 Criteria for approval of preliminary PUD application.
- 17.90.080 Criteria for approval of final PUD application.
- 17.90.090 Maximum gross floor area bonus.
- 17.90.100 Open space.
- 17.90.110 Roads.
- 17.90.120 Minor and major amendments of the final PUD.

#### **17.90.010 Intent of the planned unit development zone ("PUD").**

The intent of the PUD zone is to allow opportunity for more creative and imaginative commercial and business projects than generally possible under strict application of the zoning regulations in order that such projects shall provide substantial additional benefit to the community. It is further intended to preserve unique or sensitive physical features, such as steep slopes, views, retention of natural vegetation and to provide more open space, recreational amenities, and urban design amenities than would be available under conventional land development practices. Additionally, it is intended to promote more economical and efficient use of land and a unified design concept for commercial and business development. (Ord. 866 § 1, 2001; Ord. 710 § 87, 1996; Ord. 573 § 2, 1990).

#### **17.90.020 Where PUDs are permitted and acceptable parcel characteristics.**


A. PUDs may be permitted in all districts zoned commercial and business.

B. In the Waterfront Commercial (WC), Downtown Business (DB), Residential Business I (RB-1), and in adjacent zones, careful transition with existing development located at the perimeters of the zone must be provided.

permit decisions based solely on public opinion and political pressure. In this case, the Court should give effect to the plain language of the Code's development regulations, which will result in approving the preliminary plat and conditional use permit for the Skansie Park residential subdivision.

For the foregoing reasons, North Pacific Design respectfully asks the Court to reverse the Hearing Examiner's condition of approval requiring a revised open space calculation, and to otherwise affirm the decision of the Hearing Examiner.

DATED: March 31, 2008      **PERKINS COIE LLP**

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alexander W. Mackie, WSBA No. 6404  
Kathleen M. O'Sullivan, WSBA No. 27850  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
Telephone: 206.359.8000  
Facsimile: 206.359.9000

Attorneys for Respondents North Pacific Design,  
Inc. and Hunt Skansie Land, LLC

Kathleen M. O'Sullivan  
PHONE: (206) 359-6375  
EMAIL: KOSullivan@perkinscoie.com

April 8, 2008

**BY MESSENGER**

Clerk  
Court of Appeals Division II  
950 Broadway, Suite 300  
Tacoma, WA 98402-4454

RECEIVED  
APR - 8 2008  
CLERK OF COURT OF APPEALS DIV II  
STATE OF WASHINGTON


**Re: City of Gig Harbor v. North Pacific Design  
Case No. 36811-1-II**

Dear Clerk of the Court:

Respondents North Pacific Design, Inc. and Hunt Skansie Land, LLC filed their Respondents' Brief in this matter on March 31, 2008. Pursuant to RAP 10.4 (c), Respondents attached as Appendix B to their brief a copy of the provisions of the Gig Harbor Municipal Code (the "Code") cited in the brief. Respondents' counsel inadvertently attached the 2008 version of the Code, when we should have attached the 2006 version of the Code.

Respondents hereby submit an amended brief, with a corrected Appendix B containing the 2006 version of the relevant Code provisions. This correction makes no substantive changes to Respondents' brief.

Very truly yours,

 (for K.O.'s.)

Kathleen M. O'Sullivan

KMO:sls  
Enclosure

cc: Counsel of Record